DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 230 UD 029 305

TITLE	Shaping America's Future III: Proceedings of the National Forum on Transforming Our System of Educating Youth with W. Edwards Deming (June 8, 1992).
INSTITUTION	National Educational Service, Bloomington, IN.
SPONS AGENCY	American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.; City Univ. of New York, N.Y.; National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[92]
NOTE	148p.; For volumes I-II, see UD 029 303-304.
AVAILABLE FROM	Director of Publications, National Educational Service, 1610 West Third Street, P.O. Box 8, Bloomington, IN 47402.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Competition; Educational Attitudes; Educational Change; Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement; Educational Philosophy; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); Public Policy; *Quality Control; School Community Relationship; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS	America 2000; *Deming Management Method; *Forums

ABSTRACT

On June 8, 1992, the presidents of the nation's two largest teachers unions joined the directors and presidents of virtually every educational organization, as well as political leaders and executives from Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler in an effort to redesign U.S. schools using the quality principles of W. Edwards Deming. Panelists spent the morning focusing on creating a new paradigm for education. Deming and Peter Senge spoke on "The Foundations for Transformation." This presentation was followed by questions and two school simulations in which all panelists became students. During the afternoon, panelists divided into three breakout session addressing three topics: "Creating a Model Learning Community," "Creating an Environment in which the New School Thrives," and "Advancing to the Next Stage." Local community leaders from Connecticut and South Carolina presented their new school designs. The forum was marked by stormy debate centered around several issues including Deming's insistence on the elimination of grades and competition in schools. Deming decried systems of competition that are rampant in our society and education system, stating that the "America 2000" plan is a "horrible example" of miracle goals without method. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358230

Shaping America's Future III

A National Forum on Transforming Our System Of Educating Youth

with

W. Edwards Deming

UD029305

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. R. Shir
National Educational Service
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE III

A National Forum on Transforming Our System of Educating Youth

With W. Edwards Deming

Featuring:

Thomas Toch
Valerie A. Becker
Alan Blankstein
Linda Darling-Hammond
John Delaney
W. Edwards Deming
Keith Geiger
Pat Henry
Sonia Hernandez
Bill Honig
Crystal Kuykendall
Ann Lieberman
Victor Lowe
Stephanie Pace Marshall
Lee Mitgang
Don Nielson
Governor Rudy Perpich
Chris Pipho
Stuart Rankin
Samuel Sava
Philip Schlechty
William Scherkenbach
Ronald Schmidt
Peter Senge
Joe Sensenbrenner
Thomas Shannon
Albert Shanker
Gale Stephens
Michael Usdan
Gene Wilhoit
Ronald Wolk
Edward Zigler

From:

The National Educational Service Foundation
P.O. Box 906
1610 West Third Street
Bloomington, IN 47404
(812) 336-7714

Copyright 1992
National Educational Service
1610 W. Third Street
P.O. Box 8
Bloomington, IN 47402

All right reserved, including the right to of reproduction of
this book in whole or in part or in any form

Printed in the United States of America

Shaping America's Future III was funded in part by:

National Education Association
American Federation of Teachers
City University of New York
Baugh Enterprises
Gant Travel Management

Introduction

Shaping America's Future III is the next step on the part of the NESF in creating a new vision of educating youth in America and transforming our society.

The inspiration for this forum came from the support and direction provided by panelists of the previous two **Shaping America's Future** forums. They reached a consensus that a transformation involving all sectors of our society is needed, and that early child care and childhood education are ideal areas in which policymakers and corporate leaders can make a long-term investment in America's Future.

Recognizing the need for systemic change, members of the second forum endorsed two model projects. An interdisciplinary approach to training leaders from business and education was launched at the University of Virginia, while the NESF was granted approval by New York City's Mayor David Dinkins and Chancellor Joseph Fernandez to pilot Edward Zigler's 21st Century School Model in New York City.

On June 8, 1992, the presidents of the nation's two largest teachers unions joined the directors and presidents of virtually every educational organization, as well as political leaders and executives from Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler in an effort to redesign U.S. schools using the quality principles of W. Edwards Deming. Al Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers; and Keith Geiger, President of the National Education Association, were among the 35 leaders who joined W. Edwards Deming, International Consultant in Statistical Studies, and Peter Senge, Director of the Organizational Learning Center at MIT, to discuss the application of quality concepts to classrooms throughout the United States.

Panelists spent the morning focusing on creating a new paradigm for education. W. Edwards Deming and Peter Senge spoke on "The Foundations for Transformation." This was followed by questions and two school simulations in which all panelists became students.

During the afternoon, panelists divided into three breakout sessions addressing three topics: "Creating a Model Learning Community," "Creating an Environment in which the New School Thrives," and "Advancing to the Next Stage." Local community leaders from Connecticut and South Carolina presented their new school designs in the session on creating a model learning community. The other two sessions were charged with providing the NESF with recomendations to implement quality changes on a national level.

The forum was marked by stormy debate centered around several issues including Deming's insistence on the elimination of grades and competition in schools. Deming decried systems of competition that are rampant in our society and educational system, stating that the *America 2000* plan is a "horrible example" of miracle goals without method.

This event, which was sponsored by the National Educational Service Foundation and cosponsored by the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, was concluded by Alan Blankstein, President of the NESF, who said, "I think we're beginning the dialogue that's necessary in cutting through discussion to get to a shared mission. Our organization welcome collaboration with any organization represented today toward furthering the goal of education."

Serving as moderator for the event was Thomas Toch, education correspondent for *U.S. News and World Report* and author of *In the Name of Excellence: The Struggle to Reform the Nation's Schools, Why It's Failing, and What Should Be Done.*

In addition to this transcript, a PBS affiliate of South Carolina, WETV, will work with the National Educational Service Foundation to produce a PBS special which will focus on W. Edwards Deming, and the translation of quality principles from business to the nation's schools. The initial filming of this production began on June 8 in New York City at the **Shaping America's Future III** forum. The PBS special will include interviews with many of the U.S. leaders from education, business, and government who attended the forum.

It is the hope of the NESF that this transcript will be a valuable resource for state governments, corporations, social agencies, and schools that are seeking ways to implement the quality concempts originated by W. Edwards Deming.

Shaping America's Future III

The Participants

Moderator

Thomas Toch
Education Correspondent, *US News and World Report*

Thomas Toch has written on education for a wide range of national publications, including *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. A former writer and editor at *Education Week*, he has been a guest commentator non C-SPAN, CBS, and Christian Science Monitor TV. He was editorial consultant to the recent prime-time series *Education on Trial*, produced by MacNeil/Lehrer Productions. Toch is the author of *In the Name of Excellence: The Struggle to Reform the Nation's Schools, Why It's Failing, and What Should Be Done*, an examination of the recent reform movement in public education.

Panelists

Valerie A. Becker
Administrator, National Education Program, Chrysler Corporation

Valerie A. Becker has extensive experience in teaching, administration, and curriculum development. Her primary fields of study have included early childhood and gifted education, business/education partnerships, and work in self-esteem. She has made presentations regarding these topics at conferences around the country. In 1974, she was selected the "National Teacher of the Year" by the Association for Childhood Education. Valerie Becker has appeared as a panelist on the C-SPAN Documentary *National Education Goals* with U.S. Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander and on a world-wide PTA satellite program with National PTA President Pat Henry.

Alan M. Blankstein
President, National Educational Service Foundation

Founder and president of the National Educational Service Foundation (NESF), Alan M. Blankstein was previously marketing director of Phi Delta Kappa, a 135,000-member educational organization which produces a leading journal of educational thought and leadership. Blankstein founded the NESF, an educational service dedicated to improving the quality of education nationally, in response to his own experiences as a disadvantaged child, growing up in foster care in the inner city. Blankstein attributes his ability to complete his education and succeed in business to the availability of scholarships and the guidance and support he received from the system of social agencies that intervened and mentored him during his youth.

Linda Darling-Hammond
Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Linda Darling-Hammond is currently Co-Director of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST). She is internationally recognized for her work in educational policy research, particularly in the areas of teaching and educational equity. She co-edited *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation* in 1991 and currently edits the *Review of Research in Education*. She has authored more than 100 journal articles, book chapters, and monographs on educational policy issues.

Darling-Hammond has been a member of the American Educational Research Association's Executive Board and has served as a member of several editorial advisory boards. She has also served as associate editor of *Cross Reference: A Journal of Public Policy and Multi-Cultural Education*. She was elected to membership in the National Academy of Education in 1989, and has been a member of numerous blue-ribbon commissions at the federal, state, and local levels.

John D. Delaney
President, National Association of Secondary School Principals

Before being selected president of the NASSP in March, 1991, Jack Delaney served on the association's Board of Directors for four years. He is principal of Parker Middle School, Reading, Massachusetts, a school which was honored in the U.S. Department of Education's National Secondary School Recognition Program in 1985. Delaney was named Massachusetts Middle Level Administrator of the Year in 1985. Delaney served on NASSP's Middle Level Committee from 1983 to 1986 and was chairperson for one year. He was elected president of the Massachusetts Middle Level Administrators Association in 1984.

W. Edwards Deming
International Consultant in Statistical Studies

For forty years, W. Edwards Deming has been an international consultant. Deming is best known for his work in Japan, which began in 1950 and which created a revolution in quality and economic production. In 1951, Japanese manufacturers created the annual Deming Prize in his honor. In 1987, President Reagan awarded him the National Medal of Technology.

Deming is a member of more than a dozen professional and scientific societies, and is the recipient of numerous awards and medals. In 1986, he was elected to the National Academy of

Engineering and into the Science and Technology Hall of Fame in Dayton, Ohio. He received the Distinguished Career in Science award from the National Academy of Sciences in 1988.

He received his doctorate in mathematical physics from Yale in 1928, and has since received honorary degrees at many universities. Deming is the author of several books and 170 papers. He is a Professor of Statistics at the Graduate School of Business Administration at NYU and a Distinguished Lecturer in Management at Columbia University. He conducts lectures and seminars throughout the world.

Keith B. Geiger
President, National Education Association

Keith B. Geiger, a high school mathematics and science teacher from Livonia, Michigan, was elected president of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1989, after serving as vice president of that organization for six years. Throughout his 25-year career in education, Geiger has worked in numerous professional, political, and negotiating capacities at every level of the NEA. He previously served as President of the Michigan Education Association and the Livonia Education Association. He was a member of the NEA's 1976 Presidential Screening and Endorsement Committee and has been a delegate to two Democratic National Conventions. Geiger is currently a member of the National Council for The Accreditation of Teacher Education Executive Committee, the Labor Committee of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Commission, and the Commission on Presidential Scholars. He has served five times as a delegate to meetings of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

Pat Henry
President, National PTA

Pat Henry has been active in the PTA for 33 years. She has served in a variety of local, state, and national posts, including president of the Oklahoma PTA (1981-83), National PTA Treasurer (1987-89) and First Vice-President (1989-91). She is an Honorary Life Member of 19 state PTAs and the National PTA.

Outside of the PTA, Henry is a member of the boards of the Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Academy for State Goals, and is one of the founders of Pathway House, a rehabilitation program for drug-addicted children. She has also been appointed to the Oklahoma Governor's International Advisory team and the Governor's Advisory Committee for Education Block Grants.

Bill Honig
President, Council of Chief State School Officers

Bill Honig is Superintendent of the California State Department of Education. Honig brings to his position a broad background in education and law, and is a strong advocate of excellence in education. His educational philosophy stresses that all children can learn, that high standards and expectations are necessary for all students, and that a required core curriculum is the best way to prepare students to succeed not only in a changing job market but also in a changing society.

As superintendent, Honig has taken a comprehensive, strategic approach to improving schools. He appointed a middle grades task force to address problems at that level; in addition to establishing similar task forces at the elementary and the high school levels. The educational reform movement is now moving into its next phase to build on these gains. Educators are focusing on restructuring schools and implementing many of the recommendations from the California Education Summit, convened by Honig in 1989.

Crystal Arlene Kuykendall
President, Kreative and Innovative Resources for Kids

Crystal Kuykendall delivered a keynote speech at the ASCD General Assembly in April, 1992. A former primary, junior high, and senior high school teacher, Upward Bound instructor, university instructor, and guidance counselor, Kuykendall is a member of the Bar of the District of Columbia and is president and general counsel of her own firm, Kreative and Innovative Resources for Kids, Inc. She also has served as executive director of the National Alliance of Black School Educators. Kuykendall was appointed by President Carter to serve on the National Advisory Council on Continuing Education from 1978 to 1981 and was council chairperson from 1979 to 1981. She has presented at more than 50 national and dozens of state conferences across the U.S. She has been a consultant to the U.S. Department of Defense Overseas Schools and has also provided consulting services in Africa, Europe, Australia, and Bermuda.

Ann Lieberman
Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University

Ann Lieberman is co-director of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST). She is president of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). She has been involved as researcher, policy-maker, practitioner, and author in several areas including: restructuring schools, school/university partnerships, expanding the role of the teacher, collaborative research, and the growing professionalization of teachers.

Stephanie Pace Marshall
President, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Stephanie Pace Marshall is the Executive Director of the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, a three-year, publicly funded residential high school for students highly gifted in mathematics and science. She is also an associate of the Cambridge Management Group, Inc., a national consulting firm specializing in strategic planning for not-for-profit organizations. Marshall is the author of several journal articles, has received a number of honors and honorary appointments, and has been featured in public television and radio programs.

Shirley M. McBay
President, Quality Education for Minorities

Shirley M. McBay assumed the position of President of the Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Network on July 1, 1990, following ten years as Director of the QEM Project. Prior to serving as a member of the MIT administration, McBay served as Program Manager/Director in the Science Education Directorate of the National Science Foundation and as a member of the faculty at Spelman College in Atlanta. While at Spelman, McBay held various academic positions including Professor of Mathematics, Department Head, Division Chairman, and Associate Academic Dean.

McBay has been and is a member of several advisory boards to projects related to the education of women, minorities, and people with disabilities. She has written and spoken extensively on issues specifically related to the participation of members of these groups in science and engineering.

Lee D. Mitgang
Senior Education Fellow, Carnegie Foundation

Lee Mitgang is currently a senior fellow at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in Princeton, N.J. He is on leave from the Associated Press where he has been a reporter for 18 years on business, politics, urban affairs, and since 1981, education.

Donald P. Nielsen
Retired Chairman, Hazelton Corporation

Donald P. Nielsen served as a founder, Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer of Hazelton Corporation, the world's largest contract biological and chemical research laboratory company. He graduated from the University of Washington in 1960 and received an MBA degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Business in 1963.

Nielsen serves on the Board of Directors of Palmer National Bank, VWR Corporation, ProScience Corporation, Junior Achievement of Metropolitan Washington, and the Fairfax County Public Schools Education Foundation. He is also active in the Chief Executive's Organization.

Governor Rudy Perpich
Former Governor, State of Minnesota

Improved trading relationships and business development have been major initiatives for Governor Perpich. The creation of the Minnesota Trade Office, a division of the Minnesota Department of Trade and Economic Development, in 1983, was spearheaded by Perpich. With financial support from the state's business community, the Minnesota Trade Office has since established many foreign offices. Perpich is currently a consultant on economic development in Yugoslavia.

Chris C. Pipho
Director for State Relations, Education Commission of the States

Chris C. Pipho has been involved at all levels of the ECS Information Clearinghouse since 1972. Before joining the ECS, Pipho worked for the Colorado Department of Education and as a principal, curriculum coordinator, and classroom teacher in the Littleton, Colorado, Public School System. Pipho has authored more than fifty articles for major education journals and has served as an educational consultant. He has made more than 250 speeches and presentations regarding the minimum competency testing movement since 1976.

Stuart Courtis Rankin
Professor, University of Michigan

Stuart Courtis Rankin developed the Educational Leadership Academy initial programs for Michigan Partnership for New Education at Michigan State University. Rankin had been affiliated with the Detroit school system for thirty years, beginning as a middle-school teacher in 1953 and later serving as Assistant Superintendent (1969-83) and Deputy Superintendent (1983-1989) of the Detroit Public Schools. Rankin has been a consultant to the Department of Education, a participant in NIE hearings on minimum competency testing, Chair of NIE Network of Directors of Research and Evaluation, Representative of NIE Urban Technology Study Group, and a member of the National Executive Council and the National Board of Directors of the ASCD, among other positions. Stuart Rankin has authored and contributed to many journal articles, book chapters, and other publications, as well as making presentations on educational topics throughout the country.

Samuel G. Sava
Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals

Through his position at the NAESP, Samuel G. Sava NAESP has helped to initiate several professional development and recognition programs for members, including the National Distinguished Principals and the Elementary School Recognition programs (both in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education); the National Fellows program, a week-long residential seminar on professional skills; the Scholars Seminar, a presentation on emerging trends in education by nationally prominent researchers and government officials; and the National Principals Academy, which provides a four-year series of workshops leading to a Certificate of Advanced Proficiency.

Before joining NAESP, Sava was senior vice president of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation in Flint, Michigan; vice president for education at the Charles F. Kettering Foundation in Dayton, Ohio; and director of elementary, secondary, and higher education research at the U.S. Office (now Department) of Education in Washington, D.C.

William W. Scherkenbach
Group Director of Statistical and Process Imporovement Methods, General Motors Corporation

For the past eighteen years, Scherkenbach has worked to publicize W. Edwards Deming's part in turning around America and Japan. In 1982, Scherkenbach joined Ford Motor Company as its Director of Statistical Methods. He was responsible for guiding the implementation of Deming's philosophies, including statistical management methods, throughout the company, worldwide. He is now helping General Motors implement the Deming philosophy. He took on the assignment of Group Director of Statistical and Process Improvement Methods in November of 1987.

Prior to his time at Ford, Scherkenbach was a private management and statistical consultant, vice-president of an energy and engineering consulting firm, and member of a major management consulting firm where he specialized in reliability and maintainability. He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and New York University's Graduate School of Business, where he studied under Dr. Deming. He assists Deming in several selected seminars a year, and has himself given seminars on the management of quality on five continents. He is the author of two books, *The Deming Route to Quality and Productivity: Road Maps and Roadblocks* and *Deming's Road to Continual Improvement*. He also has written numerous articles and papers on the subject of quality and his work has been included in six recent books.

Phillip C. Schlechty
Executive Director, Center for Leadership in School Reform

Phillip C. Schlechty is founder and president of the Center for Leadership in School Reform in Louisville, Kentucky. Under his guidance, the staff of the Center provides ideas, leadership, and support to schools and school districts engaged in, or beginning, the task of restructuring. A former public school teacher, administrator, university professor, and associate dean, he is author of numerous books and articles.

In 1984, Schlechty assumed the leadership role in the creation of the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Professional Development Academy in Louisville which has helped move JCPS to the forefront of those involved in restructuring.

Ronald D. Schmidt
Chairman, President, and CEO, Zytec

Prior to the formation of Zytec, Ronald D. Schmidt spent 20 years with Control Data Corporation in various management positions. He is recognized in the *Who's Who of American Business Leaders Special Edition 1991* and a member of the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Council for Quality. He authored Section 1 and was the editor of the 1991 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award application process. Schmidt graduated from South Dakota State University with a B.S.E.E. degree in 1963.

Peter Senge
Director, Organizational Learning Center, MIT

Peter Senge is the author of the widely acclaimed The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. Dr. Senge is Director of the Organizational Learning Center at MIT's Sloan School of Management and a founding partner of Innovation Associates. Senge's work concerns the challenges of building "Leadership Organizations"--organizations that are both more consistent with human nature and more capable of competing in a dynamic, global economy.

Over 6,000 upper level managers have participated in the "Leadership and Mastery" workshop Senge co-developed at Innovation Associates. His book, The Fifth Discipline, has reached thousands more who seek to bring about fundamental innovation in management and leadership, both in the corporate world and in the public sector.

Joseph Sensenbrenner
Former Mayor, Madison, Wisconsin

Joseph Sensenbrenner is a consultant in the application of advanced private-sector Total Quality Control management approaches to public-sector service delivery. He was recognized by *The Quality Review* as one of 1988's "Ten Most Influential Figures in Quality Improvement."

As three-term Mayor of Madison, Wisconsin, Sensenbrenner was the first public official to adopt Deming's techniques on a citywide scale. From 1983 to 1989 he pioneered service improvements in virtually every municipal activity of the capital city. Madison's advances in police, streets, day care, data processing, and other areas have drawn considerable attention from private and public-sector leaders throughout the country and from the news media.

Albert Shanker
President, American Federation of Teachers

Albert Shanker has been President of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), AFL-CIO, since 1974. From 1964 through 1986, he also served as President of the AFT's New York City local, the United Federation of Teachers. In 1978 he was elected President of the International Federation of Freed Teachers' Unions, the first American to hold the post. He is a Vice President of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), and chair of its International Affairs Committee. Among the numerous boards and committees upon which he serves are the National Academy of Education, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the President's Educational Policy Advisory Committee, the A. Philip Randolph Institute, and the National Endowment for Democracy. He also serves on the President's Council on Competitiveness. Shanker has taught at the elementary and high school levels as well as at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Since December 1970, he has written a weekly column, "Where We Stand," on education, labor, economic, and human rights issues, which appears in the "News of the Week in Review" section of the Sunday *New York Times*.

Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director, National School Boards Association

A lawyer and educator, Thomas A. Shannon is a visiting professor of Educational Administration at the University of Virginia, holds a lifetime credential to administer public schools in California, is admitted to the practice of law in California, Minnesota, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and before the U.S. Supreme Court, and has earned the designation "Certified Association Executive" (CAE) from the American Society of Association Executives. He is executive publisher of *The American School Board Journal* and *The Executive Educator* magazines and the fortnightly newspaper *School Board News*, and is a regular contributor to those and other nationally distributed publications.

As executive director, Shannon serves the NSBA federation of 49 state school boards' associations and the school boards of Hawaii, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as nearly 2,000 local school boards that are directly affiliated with NSBA.

Gail M. Stephens
Deputy Director, American Association of School Administrators

Gail M. Stephens is currently a professor of educational leadership at Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo. Stephens served as superintendent of the 2,800-student Lewiston-Porter Central School District in Youngstown, New York. During her education career, she has been superintendent of the Whitmore Lake Public Schools in Michigan; district project manager for research and development in West Bloomfield, Michigan; an elementary school principal in Walled Lake, Michigan; and director of federal programs, consultant, reading/math specialist, and elementary and junior high school teacher in Center Line and Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Recently, Stephens has served on the editorial board for *The AASA Professor*, a national newsletter for professors of educational administration; the board of directors of the Niagara Frontier Industry Council; the advisory committee to the College of Education at Western Michigan University; and the AASA Resolutions Committee. She has also been an education policy fellow for the Institute for Educational Leadership and was a founding member and officer of the Oakland County, Michigan, Phi Delta Kappa Chapter.

Michael D. Usdan
President, Institute for Educational Leadership

Michael D. Usdan was Connecticut's Commissioner of Higher Education from 1978 through 1981. From 1974 through 1978, Usdan was President of the Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit.

Usdan received his masters and doctoral degrees from Columbia University, having previously completed his undergraduate studies at Brown University. He worked on the staff of the of the late Dr. James B. Conant in the latter's famous studies of American education, and has taught at Columbia University, the City University of New York, Northwestern University, Fordham and George Washington Universities, and in schools in New York City and White Plains. He also served as a member and president of the school board in the city of New Rochelle, New York, from 1969 to 1974.

Usdan has written and published many articles and books on various aspects of education.

Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director, National Assocation of State Boards of Education

Wilhoit managed the Council of Chief State School Officers' Public Confidence Project and served as Special Assistant in the U.S. Department of Education from 1979 to 1982. He has held leadership positions in education at the state, university, and local levels. He has spoken widely on educational issues, participated in numerous national education initiatives, and has designed and conducted training and technical assistance programs for private sector groups, state governments, foundations, and local public and private organizations.

Ronald A. Wolk
Editor and President, Educational Projects in Education

Ronald Wolk became a member of the board of Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) in 1960, its first year as a nonprofit corporation. He served as chairman of its board at various times until 1978. In 1968 Wolk served as the Assistant Director of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education. In 1969 Wolk was named Vice President of Brown University, a position he held until 1978. Wolk was also asked in 1969 to join the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence which was created by President Johnson and headed by Milton S. Eisenhower. In 1978 Wolk was named President of EPE. In 1981 he founded *Education Week*, and in 1989 he launched *Teacher Magazine*, a monthly magazine designed to help schoolteachers think and act more like professionals.

Edward Zigler
Founder, Head Start Program

Edward Zigler is Sterling Professor of Psychology, head of the Psychology Section of the Yale Child Study Center, and Director of Yale's Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy. He frequently testifies before Congress and has served as a consultant to a number of cabinet-rank officers. He is on the board of or serves as a consultant and advisor to over 20 professional and private organizations, and is a member of the editorial board or consulting editor for 12 professional journals. He is the author or editor of 20 books and monographs and over 500 chapters, journal articles, and media pieces.

Zigler was the first Director of the Office of Child Development (now ACYF) and Chief of the Children's Bureau from 1970-1972. He was an architect of our nation's Head Start program and succeeding efforts such as Project Follow Through, Home Start, the Child and Family Resource Program, and the Child Development

Associate (CDA) program. In 1980 President Carter requested that he chair the Fifteenth Anniversary Head Start Committee, a body charged with plotting the future course of this major intervention program. Most recently, he conceptualized and is working to implement the school of the 21st century, an effort to provide child care and family support services through our nation's schools.

Shaping America's Future III
A National Forum on Transforming
Our System of Educating Youth

With W. Edwards Deming

RICK MORRISON: Good Morning! I am thrilled and honored to be the first voice to welcome you to Shaping America's Future, the third conference presented by the National Education Service Foundation. There are two important reasons why each of us is here this morning, and I think the first reason is that everyone realizes that there is a serious problem among K-12 participants. Dr. Ziegler would even point out that perhaps it begins even earlier and that the way we look at the handling of pre-natal care might have an impact on the ingredients which enter the 12th grade. Dr. Deming, of course, states that the product out can only be as good as the product in. Obviously, with problems brewing and their critical state in our younger grades, we are now starting to see the backlash through waves of business, indeed we have businessmen here, who are just as concerned with the product that they're now interviewing for new positions. Out of that same desperation we even have district school administrators who are here willing to say, "Listen, give me something to try. Give me some new ideas. Let me take these ideas back to our district and incubate them. Let's see if we have something that's worth addressing, the change that needs to occur for our school system."

The second reason is that you either have ideas that you'd like to present on how to improve or make recommendations as to what is worth looking at, or you'd certainly like to hear good ideas about how we move from here.

And that brings us under the umbrella of the National Educational Service Foundation. NESF was formed in 1989 by a group of dedicated leaders who sought to bring together business, education, and government. The effort is to act as a catalyst, that addresses the growing social and educational needs of our children. To that end, the NESF provides a forum for discussion and a platform for action. I welcome you now to the forum for discussion. Hopefully, as the day progresses, we will visualize a plan for action.

Today we are going to split you into three panels. Those panels will help us determine the direction we should proceed toward, in terms of recommendations from the day. The panels are entitled, "Designing a Model Learning Community," "Creating an Environment in Which the School Thrives," and "Advancing to the Next Level." At the end of those sessions, we will reconvene here in the room to consider the recommendations of each panel. We will then open up for questions among the entire group. We will reconvene after incorporating those considerations brought up and hopefully arrive at final recommendations toward the end of the day. As you can see we have a very full plate before us.

To start the day, I'd like to introduce to you the gentlemen whose idea it was to present this avenue for considering change in our school system. Alan Blankstein is the founder and president of the National Educational Service Foundation. As such Mr.

Blankstein has made sure that this organization does not stop at merely identifying problems but rolls up its sleeves to try to find out ways that the problem can be eradicated. Mr. Blankstein was previously the marketing director at Phi Delta Kappa, the 135,000 member educational organization which produces the leading journal, *The Educational Thought and Leadership*. He founded the NESF and Educational Service in response to his own experience, which I am happy to bring him before you now to talk about, please welcome this morning, Alan Blankstein.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Thank you. I'm delighted to see you all today, and especially to see that Dr. Deming could make it. I imagine that he has some recommendations for a transit system after today's journey. And I'm particularly grateful that Dr. Deming is with us at not only this, but has been with us at the previous two forums ever since the inception of these Shaping America's Future Forums, so I ask that you join me in honoring Dr. Deming, a true visionary of our century.

I met with Dr. Deming last November to discuss this event and a tangential issue came up, a new book by William Glasser, which ostensibly drew on the work of Dr. Deming. Dr. Deming, in discussing it with me, said, "Can you tell me what this book means?" I said, "Can I tell you what a book about you means?" I declined that offer and added that I probably wouldn't dance for Fred Astaire either.

The fact is that I am not here to talk to you about Dr. Deming's principles; thank God we have him here for that. What I'd like to focus on is the ultimate aim of our gathering and our forum here today: to insure the health, well-being and joy, and learning for our nation's youth. In drawing on a discussion I had with Ed Ziegler a couple of weeks ago, I'd like to pay particular attention to the poorest of our nation's youth. If it were feasible I would have suggested that we meet in one of the many broken down, dilapidated schools this great nation of ours has to offer. That truly would have focused our attention.

Since we can't do that, I would like to, instead, share with you a case study of one person whom we may have met had we gone to one of these schools together. His name is Sam. Sam was born into a broken family. From the very beginning it seemed that Sam didn't have much of a chance. His parents were divorced before he was born. He was soon placed in foster care. Sam was shuffled about quite a bit throughout his infancy, from home to home, but that was insignificant compared to what awaited him. When Sam was four his mother remarried and took him back to live with her husband who turned out to be not only verbally but physically abusive toward Sam. He let the child know right away that he hated Sam, and he beat the child regularly. As a result of his tumultuous early years and abusive home environment, Sam did very poorly in school because it was there that he tried to work out his frustrations, and he became a discipline problem. One night when Sam's step-father was away on business his mother came into the room and pleaded with

Sam. She said, "Sam, I'm doing all I can, your teachers are trying, you're going to have to pitch in, too, if you want to make this work." Well, Sam was only ten years old and he didn't fully understand what she was talking about, but he vowed to do whatever she asked anyway. Although Sam had begun to get a handle on himself, he still had many, many difficulties to overcome, including an experimentation with drugs at age thirteen. At age fifteen he was returned to institutional care under the auspices of the Jewish Child Care Agency. Although he barely graduated high school, Sam was clear about one thing, and that was that his best hope for success was to go to college. So he doggedly sought grants and scholarships and eventually received assistance from the educational opportunity program which provides for those who graduate high school, show potential, and are academically and socially disadvantaged. So off Sam went to college without a dime in his pocket. He was later able to continue his studies through a series of grants and work-study programs. Sam finished college, worked for several years, went on to get his MBA and is now working to help others from similar backgrounds.

The reason I know the details of Sam's life so well is because Sam's life is my own. The infant that I spoke of was me some 32 years ago. His adolescence was my adolescence, and the young man that I referred to is now welcoming you to Shaping America's Future.

There are many factors that contributed to my coming through these difficulties, but one thing is certain and that is that I was among the lucky few. I often think back to some of those with whom I grew up. I think of Carry Davis who went into prison before he even got out of his teens. I think of Rupert Mason, who I just knew was going to kill someone someday, but he moved on and joined the army. (That wasn't meant to indicate anything, it's sublimation perhaps but...) And then there was Allen Garber, who I actually saw on 51st Street a few years ago. He lived on that street but was ashamed to tell me. The patchwork system of education and social systems that we now have in place, worked for me, but it didn't work for these kids, and it's clearly failing millions and millions of kids throughout our nation. If we are to serve them, we must reconceptualize our system of reaching and educating them because they present a myriad of problems that schools that were never designed to handle.

Dr. Deming's work, and his principles, present a unifying framework and process for transforming both our system of education and our society to meet the new challenges we now face. His work transformed Japanese industry after the Second World War, and has more recently turned around dozens of major US corporations, non-profit agencies, and even entire cities like Madison, Wisconsin. But implementing his principles will take time, and that is something I'm afraid that we're very, very short of. As I listened to the reports, as you did, of the LA riots, I was reminded of Martin Luther King who said, "We must not become a nation of on-lookers, and now is the time to act." As I saw the violence spread across our cities throughout the nation and thought about the parallel between that and the early riots of the Watts in the 1960s, I read a commission report headed by Christopher Warren, who said that we still have not addressed many of the rudimentary problems of the 60s, and that it is rare to get a second chance as we now have. As I worked on this forum for today, I thought of the words of a great American Indian chief of seven nations, who said, repeating the prophecies of thousands of years of forefathers, that the last generation, this generation, and the next generation will determine if or how we are to survive together on this planet. There's no doubt in my mind and I'm sure, looking around the room that there's no doubt in your mind either, that we, in this room have the power, the influence, and the wisdom necessary to insure the health and well-being of our next generation. And as a first step towards that mission I ask four things of you today: First, to use Dr. Deming's concepts as a framework for coming to some concensus around some of the core principles and processes essential for transforming our system for educating youth. Second, to create a vision of what schoools and learning communities can be. And then support the piloting of that vision by superintendents McAbee and Wutzl who have come here prepared to do so, and to use that as a building block for our creating an infrastructure that could support the creation of dozens of innovative learning communities. Third, to provide the NESF foundation with recommendations on involving other stakeholders in the process that we have begun today.

And, finally to provide us with recommendations on how we can advance the dialogue to the next level.

On behalf of the NESF foundation, I pledge and I promise to get the word out about all that you will accomplish here today. And more importantly, I will work with you, with the superintendents of the model school of the Pilot Projects, and all of you who make recommendations towards bringing what we have done here to fruition. We have an unprecedented opportunity this morning. So as we say on the home block, "Let's get busy". Thank you.

RICK MORRISON: Ladies and Gentlemen, now a word from the gentleman whose vision may inspire us all to assist the NESF in its quest to provide real answers to the children of the next generation, our future leaders. I present to you now, Dr. W. Edwards Deming.

DR. DEMING: As I see it, if I have to say it in a word I'll try to, our problem is that we have been bought and sold down the river on competition. I think competition has ruined us. What we need is cooperation, to work together.

A system is a series of components and they don't need to work in a series, they could be parallel, but strive to the overall aim of the system. A system must have an aim; without an aim there is no system. A system must be managed; it will not manage itself. Left to itself, the components take off as individual profit owners, everyone a prima donna seeking its own maximum. That's ruinous.

I taught the Japanese a system. Actually it was easy for them, easy for them to comprehend cooperation, easy for them to comprehend, could be right, that it was a system, a concept of a system working together for an aim. That is not competing but cooperating. That's the secret.

Richard Seabass, Dean of Engineering, University of Colorado, says I did not take to Japan in 1950 an American message, I took to them something new, a system which implies cooperation, there is nothing to stop anybody from learning and doing it.

It is forty years later, and we're still floundering. The Japanese took off straight away with it. It's no secret.

Again we have been sold down the river in competition. For example, grading in school; that's competition. It takes the joy out of learning. I like to think of it this way. I have a chart. Along the top, Forces of Destruction. Forced distribution of grades, for example only 20% "A"s allowed. You mean there is a shortage of good pupils. I don't believe it. You create a shortage, but the shortage is not natural. Gold stars, in other words competition to get to the top of the job merit system, only one in eight permitted to get outstanding, the others must be lower. You mean there's a shortage of good people? I don't believe it. Incentive pay, paper performance--performance cannot be measured. The miracle goal without a method. One of the most horrible examples of miracle goals that I have ever seen was put out by our own Department of Education, *America 2000*. A horrible example, nonsense. And think of it, from our Department of Education.

Where should we begin? What counts as a method? By what method? Dr. Nelson asks if you don't need a method, then why were you not doing it last year? Only one possible answer, you were goofing off. All that matters is the method, the goal does not help. Sure we have aims and a mission.

Explanation of Variances, a call for higher than what you estimated. How many man years are spent on explanation of variances under the conditions of all that use that effort, those brains for something positive.

Now, what happens, on the lower part, one is born with intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, dignity, cooperation, curiosity, and a yearning for learning. These attributes are high at the beginning of life, but we gradually squeeze them out by the forces of destruction: grades, rating, ranking. We squeeze out what one is born with--intrinsic motivation, yearning for learning, curiosity--and build in its place humiliation, fear, self-defense, competition for gold stars, competition for higher grades in school, competition for higher rating on the job. It leads anyone to play to win, not for fun. It cuts out joy and learning. It cuts out joy on the job, innovation. Extrinsic motivation in extreme, not just a little extrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, complete surrender to external pressure takes over and gradually replaces intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and joy. That's what's going on in the schools, on the job, everywhere. You like it? What does it take to change it? The first step, is the transformation of the individual. Once the individual transforms then the rest follows.

You have a line, a + b + c + d , that line is the sum of the individual abilities of the people in a company, organization, in a school, or whatever you'd like. There's a Mr. Lou LaToya, who was with the Ford Motor Company. I don't how long, was in Europe, came to Detroit for awhile, few months, was a pleasure to get acquainted with him. He asked me one day, why is it that the Ford company is not equal to the sum of the abilities of the people in it. That upset him more. What you have is not just the top line you also have interaction, interdependence, pairs of people, triplets of people, teams. The management in most companies is set up, I believe unconsciously in many cases, to foster and generate negative interactions between people and teams. Those negative interactions subtract from the net, overall effect. The company needs to be at least as good as the top line, why should it be less? Negative interaction is easy to generate. It's done unconsciously. For example, in the automotive industry, the management may establish say four platform teams, each one to develop an automobile. Each one will have a leader, and they will become competitive. You might say that it is good to have a company set up four platform teams for different kinds of cars. They shouldn't concentrate on one model, there should be at least four. But, establish four platform teams, and straight away they are competitive. Each leader competing for people; he wants the best people on his team. He tries to persuade people to come work on his team. He competes for funds, for supplies, automatically. The whole four teams should be under *one* leadership, not four separate ones. The four separate ones will guarantee competition. And competition is our ruination. We need to start back and erase the blackboard, competition is our ruination. We've been sold down the river, by economists on competition. All we need is cooperation. Work as a system and everyone wins.

The first step, the only step that counts, is the transformation of the individual. The individual suddenly perceives the advantage of a system. That is win-win. That transformation is discontinuous; it is not a step-by-step affair. It is not modification on modification. It is discontinuous. An analogy: there are people here whose life work is biology. A caterpillar. You say a caterpillar changes into a butterfly; it does not. It's discontinuous. The head of the caterpillar drops off. The caterpillar is dead; it's inside a mere jelly. Out of it comes a butterfly. Discontinuous.

Its personal transformation is the only step that counts. Once the individual is transformed the rest follows. It's not modification on modification.

Let me read a letter that came to me about five weeks ago this past Saturday: "My marriage went from rough to rocky to rougher and rockier, teetering, eternal trouble, win to lose each one jockeying to be the winner." Let me interrupt. In competition there is a winner and a loser. In playing a game there is a winner and a loser. You play poker, you win, I lose. We knew at the beginning there will be one loser provided we carry it out into all parts of life. As I said, "My marriage went from rough to rocky, rougher to rockier, eternal trouble, teetering, win-lose, each one jockeying to be the winner. I took your four day seminar, and learned about a system, win-win, everybody win, cooperation. I explained it to my husband. We there upon worked together on every detail that came up. Seeking win-win. Both of us win. Both win. We both won."

Who would wish to compete in a marriage? The winner would be married to a loser. Who would wish to be married to a loser? Which raised a question, a very important question, who would wish to do business with a loser? Would you wish to do business with a loser? Would you wish your suppliers to be losers? Would you wish the manufacturers of textbooks to be losers? The teachers to be losers? Pupils to be losers? Nobody wants a loser. Nobody wants to do business with a loser. No, you want everybody to be a winner. Everybody wins. That's the way we must approach it. Everybody wins. It's a matter of choice, it's not choice rather the system must be managed.

I'm going to show three tables produced by Dr. Baker of the Ford Motor Company. In the first table, there are three areas, A-B-C. Everybody chooses at every decision for himself. Division A chooses at every chance optimization for himself. Nobody knows or gives a hoot about anybody else. I choose an option for my benefit. I don't give a hoot about anybody else. No question marks, all they have is pluses on the diagonal. Every man for himself. Overall effect is not known.

Now, in Table 2, we do know the effect. A chose plus for himself, at everything that came up, chooses in favor of A. Now that hurt B and it hurt C. Add across and you get negative for the whole company. Builds a stop down the road, vetoes plus for himself. That hurt A but it helped C it so happens. Overall effect, plus for the company. C chose plus for itself at every chance, anything that came up. That hurt A and that hurt B, overall effect negative. Add it all up, one negative. Distributed into three, everyone loses $330,000. You might say that nobody comes around with a collection plate asking for donations. You're wrong. There might not be as much profit to distribute. But we do pay, we are all paying. You think that no one comes around with a collection plate then look at the income taxes. Table 2, now we have measured the effects. We all lose.

Now in Table 3, A chose negative for himself in the top line, in order to help B and C. Overall effect one plus. In the second row B chose plus for himself because it would help him and A and C. Overall effect three pluses. The third row, C chose negative for himself in order to help A and B, overall effect plus. Add them all up and you get five pluses. Distribution, every area gets $1,000,670. They all win. And Table 3, the three parts, A-B-C, are managed by overall management, teaching a system of applying it and they aim as overall win-win for the system.

Which means that sometimes some divisions will take a beating. It seems they take a beating. But actually in the end they win. People cannot understand that, we've been brought up on competition not cooperation. We have to start all over again. The easiest way is to throw overboard, what we thought we knew. Start fresh with a system on cooperation.

A good example, four weeks ago on a Monday, I went from LaGuardia field in New York to Orlando, in two hours. I learned after a few days, somehow came to my ears, a women made the trip from New York to Orlando in seven hours. She changed airplanes in Raleigh and Atlanta. Her travel department worked out a special deal with the airlines. A cheaper rate that way. Cost the traveler five hours. Now if the traveler received pay, and I hope she is paid, she has lost five hours. She probably lost half of the next day, being worn out for that ordeal of travel. Her travel department gets a plus. They won the game. And she lost, maybe five times the savings of the travel department. Can you blame the travel department for saving money? That's their job. See a system must be managed. This is an example of a system that's not managed. Every component working itself, travel department and businesses, to save money. Can you blame the manager of the travel department for saving money? Well that's his job, his life depends on it. He's not to worry about anything else. Which illustrates that a system must be managed. It'll not manage itself. I could go on and on with examples of somebody saving money, doing his job, and hurting the company considerably. The purchasing department for books, desks, anything could save money. It's the simplest thing in this world. You can always find a way to buy a cheaper, buy something else cheaper.

Anybody can save money, but look what it does. Look at what they do to the schools: they buy cheaper desks, or hodgepodge desks. A first grade teacher in Washington, had to select desks for her youngsters from a hodgepodge of desks. No satisfactory solution. The purchasing people save money by just buying desks, some of this, some of that all lopped at low price. She could not find enough good desks for her pupils. Anybody can save money, look at the effect. What did it do to the whole company, the whole school?

To sum it up, we must abolish grading, start by abolishing forced ranking, 20% A, 30% B, 30% C, 20% D. This implies that there is a shortage of good pupils. I don't believe it. If there is a shortage, it's because you made them. Once again, the transformation is for the individual. Once the individual understands all his work, his actions, his products will conform to win-win a system of cooperation. We can learn it. We have to throw overboard what we've been taught. We've been taught competition solves problems.

We had in this country a telephone system that was the envy of the world, a monopoly. Somehow people got it in their heads to open it up to anybody. A trust division divested AT&T into parts. Today we have telephone system. Our telephone companies are regulated by a federal judge. He's a pretty smart man, but nobody is smart enough. Open entry, let anybody come in, is all about business. Today, AT&T has 82% of the business, and competitors, if they have competitors, will have to invest thousands and millions of dollars that they cannot afford. Where is the money going to come from? It is going to come out of your pockets and out of mine. Their competitors, to be competitive they must spend vast sums of money. They ought to be smart and not do it. Today they merely rent circuits from each other, which is pretty smart. Because if they were to become competitive with their own equipment, somebody is going to have to pay.

One of the great contributions out of a great paper, read by Dr. Taguchi in Tokyo, in September 1960, was the *loss function*: we all pay for mistakes, and in bankruptcy, some pay more than others, but we all pay. There's a loss to society for every mistake, every failure. Think of it, AT&T had a monopoly. Today, they have 82% of the business. Open entry, let anybody come in. Who's going to pay for it? If they'd become competitive with the other companies, MCI and Sprint, you and I will do the paying. Open entry, sounds great, let anybody come in.

There's a trucking business, over the road, intercity motor freight, the idea some people had, open entry, let anybody come in, don't restrict it. We cannot afford that nonsense. Look at the amount of companies that are motor freight that are holding up.

Airlines, could anything be worse than our airlines, the first place of our transportation? We have no system of transportation. We have an interstate commerce commission, had to be appointed on the commission that you'll guarantee to do nothing. Do anything and you lose your job on the commission. You're there for the purpose of doing nothing. CAB voted themselves out of business. Deregulated airfares, let anybody come into business. 203 airlines have gone out of business in the last three years, American companies: Every failure hurts everyone of us. Open entry, anyone can come in. They're in for a while, out they go. And some institutions, Eastern Airlines, an American institution, Pan American, out, gone, we all pay. We have no train system, hardly any. Could anything be worse than our air service? Could it be worse? Wait a month. Open entry, anyone can come it, competition. Survival is not compulsory. You know of any government regulations where anyone must survive, or any company must survive. I don't know of any. There need not be survival.

Again, to sum it up, could you think of a win-win system, everybody win? Ask yourself who are we to do business with a loser? Cooperation is a whole new game. Just the opposite of what we've been taught. There's no other way out. And once again, I'll finish up, it starts with the individual. It's discontinuous. Once the individual transforms, I won't say the rest is easy, but everything that he does or judges could be done in the light of transformation. A new life, a new way of looking at things. And so be it.

RICK MORRISON: Thank you, sir. Dr. Deming, thank you very much. We'd like to suggest a slight moderation to our schedule.

And in light of those pearls of wisdom, we would like to honor any questions by way of discussion, now that Dr. Deming is here and just finished speaking. Let me introduce you to our moderator of the day. His name is one you may be familiar with, Thomas Toch. He is the education correspondent at *Us News and World Report*. He's been there since 1989. He's also written about education for a wide range of national publications, including the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. Former writer and editor at *Education Week*, Tom has been a guest commentator on C-Span, CBS and the Christian Science Monitor Television Station. He was an editorial consultant to the recent prime time series, *Education on Trial*, which was produced by McNeil/Lehrer Productions. Mr. Toch is the author of *In the Name of Excellence, the Struggle to Reform the Nations Schools and Why It Is Failing and What Should be Done*. This is an examination, if you will, of the recent reform movement in public education and it was published by Oxford University Press in 1991. Let me give you now Thomas Toch.

THOMAS TOCH: Thanks, Rick. We've had a slight change in the program. This a large group, one of great talents, impressive achievements, and no little influence in American public education. The fact that you are all here together in one room today, perhaps suggests that quality management is attracting some serious...

DR. DEMING: Quality management?

THOMAS TOCH: I knew this was going to happen and was hoping that I wouldn't be right next to Mr. Deming. I said the TM words.

DR. DEMING: What was it?

THOMAS TOCH: Quality Management.

DR. DEMING: What is that?

THOMAS TOCH: That's your job.

DR. DEMING: It is not. It's not "quality management." Quality is an output, not a method.

THOMAS TOCH: We'll say "quality," then. Nonetheless, I think it's significant that all of you are gathered here this morning to discuss the subject. It may mean, in fact, that public education is ready to discuss the issue seriously. My presence here should not be construed as an endorsement of quality as a process or as an outcome. My unpaid role is simply to help you explore the potential of quality to improve the nation's schools, and perhaps to move from the abstract to the concrete.

To start, let's spend about twenty to twenty-five minutes talking about the principles that Dr. Deming has just shared with us. Question, to what extent can we, can you, embrace Mr. Deming's central concept, the notion that competition is ruinous and cooperation is a salvation? Perhaps he would use that word to describe public education. That is by way of opening up a discussion amongst you all. Feel free to respond to that particular question to start with, but then express your own thoughts on the cooperation-with-competition concept, and feel free to address your discussions to Mr. Deming. Because of the organization of the table here, I cannot see everyone's name here on this side. While I know many of you, I do not know all of you. So please feel free to interject and introduce yourself before you'd like to speak. Would anyone like to tackle that first question?

Well Bill Honig, why don't you take a stab at it.

BILL HONIG: I'd like to ask Dr. Deming a clarification, because one of our problems in education is that we get general principles and then we misapply them without thinking, with a kind of mindless application. You can use sports analogies. Basketball teams compete, they have a standard of performance. But the concept of a pass in basketball, I'm not going to make the shot, I'm going to give it someone else who can make the shot sounds like what you are talking about. I think the idea of cooperation really works, and we should be striving for it at a smaller level, at the human level. But the broader concept gives me some trouble and that's the question I'd like to ask. We just witnessed the destruction of a system supposedly based on cooperation, communism. It was basically a monopoly system without any external checks. So, it seems to me there has got to be some synthesis between the powerful idea which came up two, three, four hundred years ago that people striving to be better does have some beneficial effects on a system and somehow combined that with the idea of working with each other, cooperating to reach a common goal. It seems to me either position by itself is not going to work, but the synthesis of the two, makes the difference. The question I would have for the schools is, to what extent is competition permissible, for example, two rows trying to reach a common goal or a school trying to reach a common standard, or a system trying to be better than another system. Are you trying to throw all of that out?

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Dr. Deming would you like to respond to that?

DR. DEMING: I didn't hear it.

THOMAS TOCH: Bill, why don't you re-summarize your point again.

BILL HONIG: Sorry, let me try and repeat that. It seems to me the idea that you are talking about is a powerful idea for education, the idea of cooperation among classroom teachers who notoriously hide material from each other and don't share for a variety of reasons because the system in your terms doesn't support it. Between youngsters who try and a few can reach certain levels...but the idea of getting large numbers to its particular level, that's a powerful idea. But the broader question I would have is, isn't there something valuable in competition, too, and aren't we really looking at a combination of those two ideas, trying to compete even as a group, as a team as in sports, to reach a certain standard? Let's say in track, you're competing against a standard, you're competing against fellows. Like the old Greek olympics, there was competition but it was towards a common ideal, and isn't there something good from both of those ideas? An example I used was from just the collapse of communism. Communism is a system, I understand, based on the idea of cooperation, and it didn't work. So how can you say that all competition is bad, can't we use that as a tool too. Although, at the lower level try and instill a feeling of cooperation towards a common goal.

DR. DEMING: The answer is "No." You're trying to hold on. Throw overboard. Transform. It is discontinuous. They are trying to hold on by their fingernails. Forget it. Sure in a game there's competition. Play poker. Nothing wrong with poker. You win, I lose, we knew at the beginning there would be one winner. Why do we carry that over into school? Examinations are attempts to achieve quality by inspection. The worst approach that there is. Bound to fail. Could not possibly be good. It's wrong. Why do we try to hang on by our fingernails? Throw overboard what we know is wrong. The individual must transform. And that transformation, again, is discontinuous.

STEPHANIE PACE MARSHALL: I just wondered, Dr. Deming when you taught your principles to the Japanese, isn't it true that within Japanese companies there is enormous cooperation, but companies compete with each other.

DR. DEMING: They do not.

STEPHANIE PACE MARSHALL: "No, they do not"? In other words Mitsubishi does nothing with Sony?

DR. DEMING: They cooperate.

STEPHANIE PACE MARSHALL: Right, I mean in other words to joint research that kind of thing? But they do want to beat out each others products?

DR. DEMING: It will take a lot of words to explain it all. User, customer, suppliers in Japan form a system. Each one working together until an improvement but some of those arrangements are twenty years old to twenty-five years old, some were in existence before I even went there. And incidently, I went at their request, not mine. The relationships are strong. It's cooperation working together, and Americans find it hard to go in and break up one of those arrangements. They sell them American stuff. You think the Japanese are going to undo relationships that they've worked on for many years? Well they'd be fools, and they are simply not going to do it. Americans see it this way. They can't break in. To the Japanese we'd be fools of the idea of someone coming in and breaking up our relationship that's has been so fruitful. By your continual improvement, better and better quality. I talked too long, I didn't know what I was doing. As Bill Leonard used to say, if you don't know what you are talking about then just talk fast. I thought that Peter Senge was going to be on the platform, but he hasn't said a word. The main contribution so far has been to help me.

TOM TOCH: Let me jump in here. Al Shanker, as President of the American Federation of Teachers you have advocated incentives for teachers and now increasingly for whole schools, yet at the same time you have singled out some schools in Germany, for example that work as cooperative teams. In other words you seem to promote both cooperation and competition. Can you help us sort out this dilemma a little bit.

AL SHANKER: Well, my thing would be sort of a follow-up on Bill Honig's, and that is that right now teachers are isolated and work in separate classrooms, and that tradition is so strong and so long that I walk in and here are my youngsters, my classroom, and I just close the door. As a matter of fact I put the children's work over the window near the door so if someone walks by they can't look in. That sense of privacy and isolation is so great even when you provide time, the habits of not sharing and not cooperating are now so strong. Now, the question I would raise is, suppose that an entire school works on the basis of school improvement, competing with another school. Wouldn't that compel the people inside the school to cooperate with each other and get out of their....In other words, going back to Bill's notion, isn't competition at a certain level a strategy for getting people inside to cooperate? Using the Japanese, now, they compete with American companies, and is that perhaps one of the things which brings them to value these long relationships because, if they disturb those... I mean they do compete at some level. They compete with American auto companies.

DR. DEMING: They did not compete at first. I'm no expert on automobiles. I can drive one. I own only one. In the 1960's the three automobile companies in Detroit had a monopoly. At the same time, there were hundreds of thousands of people who needed automobiles of low initial cost, lower than what they could get, and more dependable to run. The Japanese came in and captured that market. Were waiting. Feared by the American companies, the Japanese came in and worked on it. Is that competition? Competitors should work to expand the market. The Japanese expanded the market, the Americans failed to do it. Be thankful that you have a good competitor. As Albert Poe said, nothing can do so much harm as a lousy competitor. Be thankful that they have a good competitor. When I said that in General Motors one time, somebody said we have a lot to be thankful for.

TOM TOCH: Mr. Deming that remark might be construed to be an endorsement of school choice, but we'll leave that and move on to Lee Mitgang, who has a thought. Lee has been an AP education writer for a long time and is currently a senior fellow at the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.

LEE MITGANG: Dr. Deming--the Japanese education system. I wonder if you could talk for a moment how successfully the Japanese have bought into your model as it relates to *their* education system. We hear so much about "cram schools," for example, which seem to foster a great deal of competition amongst students, perhaps in other respects.

DR. DEMING: The competition in education is a disgrace. Frightful in Japan. Frightful. A disgrace.

TOM TOCH: Other reactions?

DR. DEMING: I wonder if they teach information or if they teach knowledge. They do teach some knowledge. When I address an audience in Japan, I taught people that had studied calculus. I can use mathematical terms, they understand them. Here the words have no meaning. Nineteen out of twenty youngsters, or people, wouldn't have any idea what I'm talking about.

TOM TOCH: Linda Darling-Hammond has just been appointed to the deanship of the Harvard graduate school of education.

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND: And still a professor at Teachers College. I just wanted to add a thought about the competition-cooperation idea that we're struggling with. It seems to me that when Dr. Deming says we are hanging on by our fingernails to the idea of competition, a way by which we are continuing to hang on by our fingernails is through the idea of competition with each other, or between, whether it's teachers, classrooms, schools and so on. As opposed to competition with a goal or standard or some idea of what we want to achieve, individually and collectively. The idea of norm referenced rankings....

DR. DEMING: It's not achieved. What do you mean by achieved. Achieve what?

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND: Well, in education I think people have a lot of ideas about what they'd like to achieve but...

DR. DEMING: Oh, do they?

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes. Ranging from those who think certain kinds of cognitive achievements are the main goals, and those who think that other goals including how students feel about themselves and their capacity to take responsibility and so on, are also important goals. And there is a long debate we could certainly have about that. It just strikes me to the extent that competition is useful, it's not going to be competition between schools or districts or teachers but competition in the sense of competition with the standard of excellence of some sort.

DR. DEMING: No. I think what you're talking about is an aim. Sure we must have an aim. You mean strive for that aim. If you call that competition then that's the wrong use of the word.

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND: That's fine with me, too. I'm not attached to the word. I'd like to get beyond it. But I think what we are ingrained in, in the American education system, and we do need to break loose from, is the whole ranking, norm-referencing idea that drives the ways in which we compare students against each other, schools against each other, districts against each other, states against each other. And the way you get ahead is by someone else getting further behind. The whole thing could be slipping, but we'll still have our rank-orderings intact. The goal has to be to think about striving, rather than maybe competition, against some aims that permeate the entire enterprise. So it is no longer a win-lose proposition. And I frankly don't think we are going to get anywhere having schools compete against each other. When we try to do that, what schools also try to do is try to compete for the best students, rather than to change the ways in which they configure what they are doing within the school. The competition becomes over who can get the easiest job, of easy to educate students.

THOMAS TOCH: The issue remains, however, how do we insure accountability in a public service? Dr. Deming has worked a great deal in the private sector, perhaps Joseph Sensenbrenner, the former mayor of Madison, Wisconsin, who was considered a leading expert on the introduction of quality techniques in the public sector, might be able to shed some light there.

JOE SENSENBRENNER: Well, just a word or two about our experience in Madison. I think that your whole approach in this area and to rewards is to be constructed on the basis of your answer to this question: Why do people do good work? If you think people do good work in order to get money or to be better than the person next to them, then you need to develop systems and structures of rewards, and merit badges, and acknowledgements because that's why people do good work.

DR. DEMING: Are you asserting that is why?

JOE SENSENBRENNER: I think that's incorrect.

DR. DEMING: "Incorrect."

JOE SENSENBRENNER: The reason, in my experience, people in the public sector, which is my work, do good work is because they want to take pride in the work they do.

DR. DEMING: Not only anywhere.

JOE SENSENBRENNER: And so, I don't think in the public sector we need to have benchmarks, evaluations, and accountabilities that will somehow, therefore, guarantee or enable us to judge how well we are doing. And we need that. I don't think we need that. I think people want to do a good job, whether they're street mechanics, or working in the park system, or affirmative action office, police officers, this struggle to find enough measurements to make sure that our people are doing a good job is a false quest. I don't think we need to do that. That's my experience in the places I've worked.

TOM TOCH: Are you suggesting that accountability is not necessary?

JOE SENSENBRENNER: I'm saying that it is so difficult and often so destructive to attempt to achieve "accountability" that our efforts are far better *directed*: The committee meetings, the reports, the hours that we spend, the time that could be reallocated to training and to working with each other. That is a far sounder path.

TOM TOCH: Not to go on too long. I'll get to you in just a second. I'm a tax payer in Madison, Wisconsin. I want to make sure my garbage gets picked up and my streets are safe. How do you as a mayor committed to quality management ensure that?

JOE SENSENBRENNER: What I would do is look at the systems and the processes and the methods that we are using, and see if I can understand the related systems we have of purchasing equipment, training our workers, hiring the right people, what happens once something is picked up. Look at the injuries to the workers. Understand the systems and processes involved, and ask the people doing those jobs, what suggestions they have for doing what they are doing more regularly--reducing the variation--and then improving what they are doing. I can benchmark also. I can look at what a surrounding community with a similar set of demographics or a similar tons per person of trash and see what they're doing.

DR. DEMING: What does that tell you?

JOE SENSENBRENNER: I think it would help me when I'm talking to the tax payers to explain that I think we are moving in the right direction, but I wouldn't look to that as a goal or guide for how I should proceed.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I think that gets to a very germane issue here, which is what obstacles do we have to overcome if, in fact, we are in agreement with regard to what Dr. Deming has said? What are the external pressures upon us that keep us moving in a direction that we don't necessarily agree with? You said that it would help you to justify it to your taxpayers, but that personally you know that that's not going to facilitate your job and move you towards improvement. So there are two different issue here, one is, what do we know to be right? And I don't know whether or not we have the ability or time to come to some agreement on that, I think that would be a worthwhile goal. And the other is, if we all agree on this, what are the pressures that lock us into doing things we know are not right?

BILL HONIG: There is a very subtle point here. I think in your presentation, you kind of very off-handedly said, "Oh well there are just some common benchmarks we can look at as far as identification or quality," and I think the real issue that we are dealing with is, you can have information on quality which we don't have. We have not come that far in education where we have a good quantifiable agreement on what quality is. Dr. Deming said, "I want kids who can listen to me and understand, or adults who can understand," that's a definition of quality. Or a writing sample at a certain level of writing is a definition of quality. We do have or are moving towards that. But let's take the next step. Here's a school getting 60% or 70% of its kids or 90% of its kids to a certain level of performance in writing. That is a useful piece of information even if you're not going to use it competitively, even if you're not competing with other schools. I want to be the best, but you just want to have some idea of what you can accomplish, what is accomplishable and what can be accomplished with a given set of kids. If a school next to you is getting 90% of its kids to a decent writing level and you're getting 30%, you got some work to do.

DR. DEMING: What's this, 30% of what?

BILL HONIG: Let's say we agree that, like the Olympic skating, there is a certain level of writing performance that we say or agree that is a commendable level of writing or an average level or mediocre, whatever the standard is. We agree that this is what it looks like when a kid does it right. So now you have a sense of what quality writing is that's agreed upon. People look at that teacher and say, "That is what were talking about; that's our aim." As you would say, that's the aim, to get that youngster to that level. Now the question is how many kids do we get to that level in this particular school? It's a useful piece of information to know that a school across the way, or in the country, or in the world someplace, is able to get 90% of its kids with the same resources, the same kids, the same other conditions being equal, they are able to get 90% to that level, we're only getting 30%. If that's the case, that piece of information is very useful in leading to what Al was talking about: what the hell are they doing in these other schools to get that many kids to that level? Maybe we should take a look at what we are doing. And I think that is the friendly kind of competition that Linda is talking about.

DR. DEMING: Does that indicate that there is a difference between the schools?

BILL HONIG: I'm postulating that you have, let's say, the same kids, same resources and there must...

DR. DEMING: Does that indicate that there is difference between the schools?

BILL HONIG: I think it does.

DR. DEMING: NO!

BILL HONIG: YES!

DR. DEMING: NO!

BILL HONIG: Yes, I'll give you the example in California, we had schools where we gave...

DR. DEMING: Did you all have time to do the red beads now? In the experiment with the red beads, everybody had the same chance...

BILL HONIG: Wait, wait, let me finish the example. Feeding back to these schools our writing performance to reach a certain level had a profound effect on a high number of schools in the state that look at, in your terms, their system of teaching writing, which was a non-system that was individually driven. We had a lot of individual transformation. They went to writing courses on how to teach writing. They changed their outlook. They came back into this system and were very frustrated; they hit a brick wall. So what they did is, these schools, the management in your terms, took a look at what's the system of teaching, and it wasn't stressed. There wasn't a system, so they basically said as a school we are going to stress writing in a whole variety of places, and in a couple of years you had huge increases in the output in number of kids meeting this quality aim. I don't know why we have to resist that as being inconsistent with cooperation.

DR. DEMING: I do. I know why.

BILL HONIG: Well, you're going to have to explain this because we are the ones doing this. We don't understand it.

DR. DEMING: We'd better find out. We'd better understand it. What you thought was differences between schools was not at all. How do you know?

BILL HONIG: You have a concept of normal variation around a mean. I think that's a...

DR. DEMING: I do? I do? You mean you do. I do not.

BILL HONIG: Well then I misunderstood you. There is a normal variation that occurs in systems but there are real differences between the quality output in one school and another, and you can tell as a professional that these kids are really at a higher plane of education.

DR. DEMING: Which indicates what?

BILL HONIG: Which indicates that they are doing something right.

DR. DEMING: NO! Not at all. There's where you're wrong, and until we straighten that out, there is no hope.

BILL HONIG: Straighten it out because we have a big gap in communication.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: We have someone, who has worked with Dr. Deming's principles extensively within a system that has been addressing transformation, right here, Bill Scherkenbach. Maybe you could elucidate a little bit for us, Bill. Excuse me, Bill Scherkenbach, as many of you know, is Director of Quality and Statistical Process at General Motors.

BILL SCHERKENBACH: There is going to be no simple way, in my experience, to answer that question without knowing really where the group is, or where you specifically are in understanding variations, understanding systems, understanding the contribution of a particular outcome that you looked at, what the variation is over time. You've come to a quick assumption that the differences are in the school system. You know before you start that you never will have the same students. I mean that has always been the argument when you look at public, private, or between any districts that some of them have different students and they all have different students. You have different teachers, you have many different variables. Part of the problem is that in the short run most any brilliant idea works. You can show that anything you try will have some success somewhere, and we have what some people would call superstitious learning based on that. I'm not arguing that you wouldn't come to the conclusion that what you tried worked. The question would be what happens to the other parts of the system, and especially over time? Many times we don't give it a long enough wheel base, many times we don't in our optimization...

BILL HONIG: If you're saying, "Look we have to be skeptical about changes and improvements," I think that's perfectly permissible and

"Is it a real change in performance?" But that's not what's being said, as I understand it. The whole premise of this conference, the materials start out with is that American education is failing. Its performance isn't high enough. That's a measurement right there. That basically is the same thing that we're saying at a lower level somebody must have some idea of quality performance that students aren't measuring up to. So the whole premise of why we are around the table is that there's a gap between what we want and what we've got. If twenty years from now we are up to somebody's level of performance, are you going to say that that's normal variation around the mean or we don't trust it? That leads us to no place.

BILL SCHERKENBACH: I agree with you there.

TOM TOCH: By the way, for those of you who don't know, Bill Honig is superintendent of public instruction in California, where about one in ten of the nation's students attend public school.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: What were you going to say Bill?

BILL SCHERKENBACH: I don't think I would argue with the fact that we can have in mind an aim and a vision for what things could be, and certainly I would advocate that we should have some sort of idea of where we are. The underlying part of Dr. Deming's philosophy is continual improvement. I would argue whether the

American system of education is failing, but no matter whether it's failing or successful, by whatever standard, it always can be improved. Everything we do must be continually improved.

BILL HONIG: Isn't it helpful in a school if I know I'm doing my job as a teacher, isolated? I have a certain sense of self-esteem, I care, I've got a sense of pride, I've got a sense of professionalism, I care about what I'm doing, and I think I'm doing about the best I can. Now, before I'm willing to change, somebody's got to show me that there's another method, or techniques, or systems that can take the same kids I'm dealing with and get them appreciably higher. Something that is legitimate, we'll work on something that's legitimate and whether it's variation. It's a phase leap; it's a different level of performance. If somebody can demonstrate with those kids, or similar circumstances, that they can double or triple the amount of kids that can reach certain levels, and I buy that, I'm much more willing to say I'm going to go through the training or changes necessary to do that. That piece of information is crucial because most people don't believe it, now. They don't believe they can get those kids to that level.

BILL SCHERKENBACH: It's crucial to you, but let me just finish this. Not finish it...Change as I have seen it in large organizations, at Ford and General Motors and part of the government, it takes place at three levels: physical, logical, and emotional. Now what you're mentioning could be a combination of primarily logical, maybe some physical to need to be shown. But for other people, that's not necessary for change; you don't need that. You can have significant logical events, significant emotional events, and significant physical events to effect change, to effect that transformation. Our plan, what I hoped we would get to today, is that we are able to address it on all three of these levels. Just because it works for us doesn't mean it'd work for anyone else.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I think to address it cohesively it's going to take a smaller group interaction, but at the moment to Stu Rankin. He is the former Deputy Superintendent of Detroit Schools and has worked quite a bit under the Deming concepts within schools, and he wants to make a comment on what you're saying.

STU RANKIN: I guess two things. One is kind of a response to Bill a little bit. Those teachers who are in that school who don't know a better way and look for another model, I'm glad they are looking for that. What I would hope would be that each of those schools would become a self-renewing. I think Peter uses something about a learning organization. I mean the same by that, Gardner's institutional renewal. That in every one of those schools, we've got to find a way to provide enough time to teachers and others who work there so that they can be a self-renewing institution. And that they are continually looking at how can we do this better.

And it isn't necessarily looking to the next school or finding one that has a higher score or something. It is that we have an aim here. We are trying to achieve that aim. We are doing it in a cooperative way, but we are a self-renewing institution and that's the essence of it. And so we are continually trying things, predicting to see how they work, checking to see if it's any better. But we need, as school people, to have the support that we are allowed to do that, that we have the time to do that, we are encouraged to do that. That we are trusted as professionals to be able to do that. And in a sense, in response to Tom's question on accountability, we get off track. People keep asking me how are you going to be accountable, I mean I just say we are open, come look. I mean if I try to say to you, "Here is a report that will tell you, make sure where we are common," you're not going to pay attention to the report. People don't choose schools or school districts on the basis of some report that so many kids get into college or something like that. It's kind of word of mouth, and that's just about where it is. And so I think we ought to concentrate our attention how we go one school at a time, trying to make it better and better by having the people who work there try to come clean with the evidence they will accept that the aims are being met. Try to be open about that.

DR. DEMING: Evident? Evident?

STU RANKIN: Yes, sir.

DR. DEMING: Very dangerous.

RICK MORRISON: I think--excuse me Dr. Deming--I think that the burden of proof given the skepticism expressed by Bill Honig and some others for this group gathered here today, is to find ways to ensure improvement in the public education system through cooperation, through half of Dr. Deming's equation here. We are out of time in this session, but we will hear from Peter Senge and two school administrators, public school administrators, later in the day, all three of whom will hopefully help us, help you, understand the ways in which improvement in public education system can be achieved through cooperation. Let's take a twelve minute break and re-group as close to twenty of eleven as we can.

***

RICK MORRISON: Thank you for coming together rather quickly. If I could invite those from the outer hallway back inside, we will resume.

Just by way of housecleaning, it has occurred to me, ladies and gentlemen, perhaps some of us are a little unclear as to how we will approach the three break-out panels. Attendance, or your decision to attend one of those panels, unfortunately will preclude you from attending any of the other two because they are concurrent panels. So, let me remind you of the three panels. It's your decision on which one you'd like to attend.

Now, I'm going to bring aboard the gentleman who probably would be the best able to facilitate transition from Dr. Deming's very lofty charge to some area of practicality. This is a gentlemen who has spent quite a bit of time applying Dr. Deming's philosophy to our everyday lives, and has met with considerable success afield in his endeavor. I speak of Dr. Peter Senge. Dr. Senge is the widely acclaimed author of *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practices of the Learning Organization*. Dr. Senge is the Director of Organizational Learning Center at MIT's Sloan School of Management. He is founding partner of Innovation Associates. The work of Dr. Senge and his colleagues focuses on the thinking and interacting skills needed to lead and manage in a world of increasing interdependence and change. In particular, they concern themselves with the challenges of building leadership organizations. Organizations that are more consistent with human nature and more capable of competing in a more dynamic, global economy. Dr. Senge's work translates abstract ideas, if you will, systems of theory, collaborative learning, and personal creativity into practical tools for managers and leaders. Over six thousand, upper level managers have participated in the leadership and mastery workshop that Dr. Senge co-developed. And his book, again, *The Fifth Discipline*, has reached thousands more who seek to bring about fundamental innovation in management and leadership, both in the corporate world and in the public sector. The learning center he directs at MIT is a world leader in research, creating learning tools and learning processes which are developed collaboratively with leading organizations such as Apple, Ford, Proctor and Gamble, Hanover Insurance, Polaroid, and Royal Dutch Shell. Please welcome with me now, Dr. Peter Senge.

DR. SENGE: Let me tell you a little about what we had planned for this section here, and then, of course, we are moving to the smaller group sessions for much of the rest of the day. First off, let me tell you what I'm not going to do. I'm not going to interpret Dr. Deming's work. OK? Because he can speak for himself; he doesn't need someone else to speak for him, just as each of us can speak for ourselves. Now, what I would like to do is share with you a little bit of what I have gone through in the last couple of years as an individual trying to understand his work a little more, and understanding against the backdrop of things that I and my colleagues at MIT, Harvard and our training consulting business have been working on for twenty years. I'll say a few words about that up front and that's more in the spirit of helping you know that I'm in the same shoes as you are, which is trying to form my own interpretation of what this means.

What I'm most interested to bring about in this next hour or hour and a half is beginning to think through how would these sort of ideas and principles, and I'll elaborate in a minute what I mean by these sort, begin to find their way in a natural and enduring manner into education? Now, I have one huge handicap in starting this off. And the handicap is that I'm not an educator. Not in the sense of spending my life wrestling with the problems of public education. Now I 'm am educator in another way, but I don't know much of what you know out there in that world. I'm not part of that system. So in putting this section together, Alan was nice enough to let me invite a very dear friend and colleague, someone who knows a lot of what I don't know, Sue Miller-Hurst, to do it with me. Sue is back there and you will meet Sue in a few minutes. Sue has spent her life in education. She was principal of the second largest high school in Oregon. She was principal for five years in an extraordinarily innovative elementary school in Oregon. She has spent a long time in creating and thinking about innovation in education.

So Sue and I are going to do this thing together. I'm going to offer general comments up front to sort of frame it, and then actually what we'd like to do is create a little microcosm here, sort of throwing us all into the soup. Because there is a real soup out there, and we all know it and sort of feel it in our gut. And we sort of push and prod and say, "Geeze, we get a little bit here, little bit there," but maybe we just need to, as Dr. Deming sort of suggested, let it die, and maybe something really new is ready to start to be born.

Well, let me if I could, just partly of a way of introducing myself but also partly as providing something of a bridge to what Dr. Deming talked about before, just share with you a little of my personal odyssey in coming to some terms with his teachings which I still understand only a little bit. Just a little bit. So this is not a summary-interpretation of his teachings. And I would say much same about other really original thinkers who I've spent a good part of my life trying to understand their teachings. Years ago, I used to hear about "Total Quality Management" and Deming, and I had no interest whatsoever. Because I thought what it was all about was statistics and, hell, like many of you, I studied statistics in undergraduate and graduate school, and I couldn't see how the methodology of statistics, as I had studied it, could possibly lead to anything significant in the way of profound change in the way our organizations operate.

Then one day, I had the good fortune of having someone call and take me to lunch who Dr. Deming has known for many years, Myron Tribus. Myron was at that time at MIT; he was the Director of the Center for Advanced Engineering Studies. He had been the vice-president at Xerox, he had been the dean of engineering at Dartmouth, and he was one of Dr. Deming's first disciples in this country. And Myron took me to lunch and he had read a article that I and my colleague had written, this was about ten or twelve years ago, and said, "Hey you're talking about Dr. Deming's management philosophy." And I said, "What are you talking about? You find a statistic in this paper." And he said, "Oh no, no, you don't understand at all. First off, you teach the statistical methods to the workers." And for the first moment, right there, I had a glimmer of something. Why in the heck would you teach the statistical method to the workers, unless that was part of some fairly fundamental redistribution of authority in the organization? That started to get interesting.

What really hooked me, though, was two years ago when I asked him to write something to go on the back jacket of the book that Rick mentioned, when it came out. What he wrote, I sort of ponder regularly, and a good bit of it was actually written on that very first slide I put up for him. What he wrote was, "Our prevailing system of management has destroyed our people. People are born with intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, joy in learning." And then he went on to say, "The destruction starts with toddlers. Prize for the best Halloween costume, gold stars, grades, and on up through the university." I have pondered that. It seemed, to me at least, a sort of central territory. A central territory is actually very simple to express. It doesn't mean that it's simple to take action, but I think it's pretty simple to express. I do believe that human beings are intrinsically motivated to learn. Edward Hall who is a retired anthropologist, living out in Santa Fe, quite a preeminent anthropologist, wrote an article not too long ago called "The Drive to Learn," in which he said, "The drive to learn is the most basic drive in the human species. More basic than the drive to reproduce." I also think our institutions are predominantly social institutions, working business are fundamentally designed to control.

And that mismatch is why we are here. Profound mismatch between the intrinsic nature of people, the drive to learn, and the fundamental design principles of our institutions, which is to control. The other thing Deming did in those few sentences he wrote, which by the way he didn't just write for my book, this was something he had been talking about in many places. He made a connection. He said, in effect, we've got to go upstream. See, all of our work in the world of business, trying to create what we've come to call learning organizations, organizations that are more fundamentally consistent with the drive to learn, probably won't ever add up to much. After all, how do you tell a twenty-year-old, or a nineteen-year-old, or eighteen-year-old, or whatever person first enters the work force, that here you're a life-long-learner, when the previous fifteen or eighteen years of their life had been about performing for someone else's approval. I'll never forget, years and years ago--before I had any sort of coherent thinking about education, just a deep interest, as I think we all do, because the concern for the rearing of our young is very deeply embedded, much more deeply embedded than any of these institutions we are talking about--very many years ago, I remember reading an article by an educator that said we have no idea of the trauma the young child suffers in school. I've never forgotten that sentence. I know what it meant. I never forgot that sentence. We have no idea the trauma the young child suffers in school. Every child learns very quickly that school is not about learning. School is about performing for someone else's approval. How in heaven's name can we go about building a new system of industrial management that's fundamentally about learning and continuous improvement if all the people coming into that system know that the name of the game is just performing for someone else's approval? The child learns very quickly, it's about getting the right answer and avoiding the wrong answer. What could more directly violate any theory of learning than that statement? None of us have ever learned a damn thing in life except through one process, which is making mistakes. And yet the child learns right away this is not about making mistakes it's about getting it right. If you've got the right answer, then you get your hand up. If you don't have the right answer, avoid the teachers eyes. Why do people never sit in the front rows of rooms? We all know that--sit in the back row, you are safer. See it became very apparent to me that we could not do what we were trying to do in business, if we did not go upstream and address some of these issues.

So that's by way of a very short sketch of my own sort of personal odyssey here. I'd like to pick up one comment that Dr. Deming made, actually referred to it a minute ago, and sort of hang it up out in front of us. And use it as sort of the theme that Sue and I and all of us can sort of explore for the next little while: What does it really mean to let the old system die? What's the nature of something new that's waiting to be born? You know, when he says the caterpillar does not become the butterfly, the caterpillar dies. That's a pretty interesting image. I think that today we have a sufficient base of knowledge to create an entirely different system of public education. I think we have that. That is not to say that I think there is a formula, nor a model, nor three steps to follow that would do the job. But I think, we have been gradually--and the "we" is a very broad "we"--building some cornerstones. Which, if we have the will, we can begin seriously translating into practice. I believe those cornerstones have to do with appreciating this drive to learn and the nature of the learning process. I think there has been an enormous amount of knowledge built over the last thirty or forty years, understanding just more deeply how human beings really learn, the remarkable diversity in which we learn, and the fundamentals in which we all learn. And the more you understand that, the more you see the gaps between that body of knowledge and the way we design a schoolroom, and the way we design a school. I believe we have learned a great deal about how to create an institutional *milieu* that is not primarily oriented towards controlling, that is in fact, predominantly oriented towards learning. That is to say that everyone, everyone, without exception, whatever sort of role or relationship they have in connection with that institution, sees their predominant task as being about learning. I think actually we've learned a great deal on how to develop that sort of organization.

And lastly--this is my own personal hobby-horse, so you'll forgive me--my own background is that I've been at MIT for over twenty years as part of a group trying to understand and develop basic tools for understanding complex human systems. The third cornerstone is that we now actually do know a great deal about the nature of complex human systems and what it would mean to ground an education process in understanding interrelationships. Now that might sound a little abstract to you, relative to the first two comments. Let me tell why it's not abstract. The reason it's not abstract is there is one underlying crisis underlying all crises in the world today. We, as a species, create interdependency. Which we don't understand, and then we are trapped in it. We point our fingers and blame each other, not recognizing that we need an entirely new way of thinking to understand the consequences we're having in our world. Einstein said it very succinctly. Shortly before he died he said, "We cannot change the world from the level of thinking at which we've created it." We need a new level of thinking. And we are starting to understand what that new level of thinking is all about.

Now hang in there with us if you will. I realize some of those comments may make a lot of sense, and some of them may be pretty abstract, you're not sure exactly what they mean. But Sue and I are going to endeavor in the next little while to engage us all, somewhat firsthand, in exploring this. Now here is the way we are going to start off. We are going to start off by creating a little school room. Right here. Just a little one. You'll be happy to know in advance it won't last long. If you will, we are going to try to create a microcosm. A principle that we've always found very valuable in our work is "Don't talk about it too long." Do something. Create a microcosm and then let's all reflect together on what we are learning from it. So we are going to create a little microcosm in here of a schoolroom, and we are going to look at the way it's sort of traditionally been done, and then we are going to consider an alternative way to do it. Then we'll all spend a little time reflecting on the difference between the two, and use that as a starting point for our broader reflections on what really would these cornerstones look like that we might start to get serious about. OK? You game? By the way, by all means, gentlemen please feel free to take off your coats.

SUE: Not yet!

DR. PETER SENGE: Oh! I'm sorry. I violated the first rule.

SUE MILLER-HURST: OK, remember we are playing. This is the only context setting I want to do. We are playing and the issue is not to blame anyone. In a sense we are not looking for blame. It's *Pogo*: we have met the enemy and he's us, all of us. OK, so we are going to begin this class, if you will.

I'm glad you all came today, although you had no choice. I would like you to sit up straight and act as if you're paying attention, even if you're not. I really mean that, sit up straight. Some of you take this very humorously. It's not funny, I don't see anything funny at all. This is a class in which you're expected to do your best. I'm going to go over the rules for this class. They should look a lot like the rules you have already endured in this school; they are very important. First of all, you will be graded on everything you hand in. The grades will be on a curve with 90 to 100% being excellent and the score of 60 or less, failing. I expect some of you will fail this class, usually people do fail this class. I'm a very tough teacher. I've had some of your sisters and brothers, so I know what to expect from you. Some of you are laughing; it isn't funny. There is no humor in this class, we have to get busy. I want you to look at the class rules. They are set up to assist you in learning. Continue to sit up straight, please. Raise your hand to speak, I want no talking in this classroom, unless you have raised your hand and asked permission. Sit up straight. Eyes forward. Pay attention. Hands to yourself. Show respect for the teacher and all adults always. And do your own work, there will be no cheating. Is this pretty much understood, and how do you feel about it? Are you all sitting up straight?

I will tell you about today's lessons perhaps as an overview and then I'm going to give you a short test which will assist me in putting you in the three reading groups. The tigers, ferocious group of learners, you know who you are. Most of you are already sitting in the front row for me. The parrot group, which has been working at an average rate, and I expect the same in this class. And the fish group, always swimming upstream. Some of you, of course, are labeled "disabled." You'll be leaving the class periodically to get assistance for your problems. It isn't that we blame you, we just know that your less able than the rest. So there will be no making fun of you as you leave the room during different periods today. Remember that the grammar assignment today will be to diagram sentences. You've learned this last year; you should remember it from over the summer. Our math work sheets will be due, there's about fifteen of them. For those of you who are slow in math, this is going to be a problem for you, and you may have to stay after school. History, we will read chapter one and do all of the questions. I think there must be about fifty questions and I'll expect you to work very hard during history period.

Now for the test. I don't mean to frighten you, but I want to tell you that most people flunk my original test. I've been teaching for thirty years, and I looked over your previous scores coming in here, and I wish to tell you, somewhat sadly, that this is the worst group I've ever seen. I'm not expecting much, but I'll do the test anyway. Here are the rules of the test. I will give you twenty words in a row, orally, there will be no writing down. I will be watching for cheaters. Albert, where are you? I have a record of you cheating from last year. So I want to be sure that you don't do it. Now, I will give you these words and what I will ask you to do is to repeat them in order. This will of course, test your memory which is the best indicator I have of your real intelligence. I wouldn't get too nervous if you end up in the fish group. It's all right. You won't go to college, but there are jobs you can get. I know McDonald's is looking for workers right now. So, alright, here we go, is everybody ready? Eyes open. Ready to go? Here is the list: paper, carpet, door, bottle, bed, fish--some of you have already given up; I can tell it in your face--fish, chair, window, flowers, cigarettes, nails, typewriter keys, shoes, cup, elephant, donut, Goodyear Blimp, Empire State Building, George Bush. Now, who can give me those words back in exact order? Do I see any hands? Yes, Stephanie. You wrote them down and cheated. Would you please go see the principal? This is what happens to people who cheat. I'll have to write her name up here. Can anybody name two? Let's begin. Anybody? You could name two.

KEITH GEIGER: "Paper" is first, and "George Bush" is last.

SUE MILLER-HURST: I don't know how to tell you how humiliating it is to be a teacher and see this kind of response in you. What kind of a class is this? Do any of you know the second or third? Yes. Pardon?

AUDIENCE: "Carton" was second.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I though it was "carpet."

SUE MILLER-HURST: Was it carpet? We've got two out of twenty.... This is the largest fish group I have ever had.

Now if you'll close eyes for one second, and forgive me. And forgive all the people you've ever seen and all the situations you have ever been in that felt a little bit like this. We'll begin again. OK, new classroom. If we had time we were going to do this differently.

Give me some music, class has started you just got in. OK, you have just come into class. Give me some music. I'd like you to turn to somebody next to you and tell them they're great, if you will. Start by telling someone next to you how great they are. OK, we are going to start out our morning with sitting aerobics, if you are ready. And the rule in sitting aerobics is that we don't want to do so much that we sweat, but we will do a little and get the blood flowing. OK, give me some new music. It's going to be real easy for those of you who haven't moved in a while. Shake that stuff. We are going to start out, first of all by just moving your face around. Now turn your face this way, and now the other way. Those of you in the audience, there is no audience. Now circle. Now one arm. Now the other arm. You're doing good. Now raise one foot. Now the other one. Now two. Now everybody stand up. Take your coats off. Here we go, good words--"I've got a new attitude!"

OK, let's sit down. Take your coats off and loosen your ties, come on guys. Take off one or the other of your shoes, I don't care which. Some of you who are really forward, like Bill Honig, can take off his socks, even. I have a game to play with you and there is going to be some words, and you're going to find out at the end of this story I tell you, you're going to have a phenomenal memory, better than you ever imagined. OK, no concentration on the words. I don't care at all. Play with me the story, that's all. Get yourself as comfortable as you can, and I really mean that about loosening up your ties even if you came in with a position at stake. We'll all let loose at once. Come on. OK, here we go.

Once upon a time, say we were walking to this place and there was a paper falling out of the sky, sort of. We are watching it fall and it sort of falls right to us. Unbelievable. You say to yourself, "Lucky day." You grab this paper out of the sky and look at it. It's a piece of pink parchment paper. Sort of unique, odd size. You're holding that paper, and just then it turns into a carpet. It unravels into a carpet and you're wondering what in the world is going on. You start to follow the carpet and it takes you through different blocks. Up and down streets, you're paying almost no attention that you're walking on this thick carpet. In fact it's so plush you take off your shoes to feel the thick plushness. All of a sudden you end up back at your hotel door. Quite a walk for some of you, and you didn't even notice it. You walk in the door and there is a bottle sitting down there so you hit the bottle. It is sort of milk-bottle shaped, those old fashioned milk bottles and you realize how thirsty you are, especially after those sitting aerobics. So you want to drink something, but it's empty. Now you say, I've walked all the way home, forget the Shaping America Conference, I'm going to take a nap. So you go into bed. You turn down the bed covers, and in the bed, you find a six foot long, still alive, slimy and jumpy, fish. (There's a joke here, I know, but I'm going to leave it.) You say, "What is a fish doing in my bed?" You grab the chair, next to the bed, and throw it through the window. Of course it breaks the glass and each piece of glass that hits the ground grows up into the most incredible flowers. Because you have the first floor room you can lean out of your window and pick up those flowers. You start to smell the flowers. They smell like roses, absolutely beautiful. All different colors of flowers. You're smelling those flowers. You say to yourself, "Wow." Just then, they turn into cigarettes, a whole group or cigarettes. You don't smoke so your sort of mad about this whole pile of cigarettes. You don't know what to do with them and so you put them in your mouth. Now you have a whole mouthful of cigarettes that don't taste good. Just then they turn into long, spiked nails. Oh it's a terrible taste of iron in your mouth. So you decide to spit them out. Just as you do that, as each one hits the ground, as each nail hits the ground, it turns into a typewriter key. You keep on spitting until you have an entire typewriter down there. "Weird," you say to yourself. "It's been a weird day." You take one of your bare feet that still is bare from walking on that carpet, you step on that typewriter, it cinches around your ankle. And now you look pretty weird as your walking down the street with one typewriter shoe, and nothing on the other foot. So you have a shoe on this foot that is pretty weird. You can't help where it goes and it bumps into a cup. It's an odd shaped cup with two handles. Written across it, "Shaping America Conference." Now what is this doing? So you grab the cup and you are still thirsty. You want to drink out of the cup. What's inside instead, is a jelly donut. Go ahead and have it. So you take a bite of this jelly donut. You have got jelly all over you face. You go for a second bite, it's tasting scrumptious. And just then this donut turns into a huge elephant. It starts to grow like a helium balloon. Go up, up, up. You're watching it go as high as it can. All of sudden the elephant turns into a Goodyear Blimp. You say to yourself, "What event could this be that the Goodyear Blimp came for?" Sure enough, the blimp is going around the Empire State Building trying to say that there is some kind of celebration. And then you find that they are delivering a birthday cake, it's the biggest birthday cake anyone has ever seen. It's the size of a football field and it says "Happy Birthday, George Bush." Let's see how we do. We'll do it as a group, ok? First, what fell out of the sky?

AUDIENCE: Paper.

SUE MILLER-HURST: And then it turned into a...

AUDIENCE: Carpet.

SUE MILLER-HURST: And it ending up at your...

AUDIENCE: Door.

SUE MILLER-HURST: And you opened the door and it hit a...

AUDIENCE: Bottle.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Now you decided to go to...

AUDIENCE: Bed.

SUE MILLER-HURST: But what was in your bed was a...

AUDIENCE: Fish.

SUE MILLER-HURST: So you threw the...

AUDIENCE: Chair.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...through the...

AUDIENCE: Window.

SUE MILLER-HURST: When the glass fell to the ground up came...

AUDIENCE: Flowers.

SUE MILLER-HURST: You pick the flowers and they turned into...

AUDIENCE: Cigarettes.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...which turned into...

AUDIENCE: Nails.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...which you spit out into...

AUDIENCE: Typewriter keys.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...which you stepped on and became a...

AUDIENCE: Shoe.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...which you bumped into a...

AUDIENCE: Cup.

SUE MILLER-HURST: And what was in the cup?

AUDIENCE: Donut.

SUE MILLER-HURST: That turned into...

AUDIENCE: Elephant.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Which turned into the...

AUDIENCE: Goodyear Blimp.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...which went around the...

AUDIENCE: Empire State Building.

SUE MILLER-HURST: And then they delivered a...

AUDIENCE: Birthday cake.

SUE MILLER-HURST: ...for...

AUDIENCE: George Bush.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Would you give yourself a round of applause. Wait, we are better than we think. We don't have to have a story. Who'll try it, for the sake of all of us? Just one, two, three. Who'll do it? Anybody. Albert probably will. He's the sweetest guy. Let's do it together. Let's do it fast.

SUE MILLER-HURST AND AUDIENCE: Paper, carpet, door, bottle, bed, fish, chair, window, flowers, cigarettes, nails, typewriter keys, shoes, cup, donut, elephant, Goodyear Blimp, Empire State Building, birthday cake, George Bush.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Now watch this, you even know it backwards. Ready?

SUE MILLER-HURST, AND AUDIENCE: George Bush, birthday cake, Empire State Building, Goodyear Blimp, elephant, donut, cup, shoes, typewriter keys, nails, cigarettes, flowers, window, chair, fish, bed, bottle, door, carpet, paper.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Give yourself a hand. Watch what else you can do. Let's go forward with the story. What comes after carpet?

AUDIENCE: Door.

SUE MILLER-HURST: What comes before elephant?

AUDIENCE: Donut.

SUE MILLER-HURST: What comes before Goodyear Blimp?

AUDIENCE: Elephant.

SUE MILLER-HURST: What comes after window?

AUDIENCE: Flowers.

SUE MILLER-HURST: Now going the other way. What comes before window?

AUDIENCE: Chair.

SUE MILLER-HURST: I'm going to say to you in a story that lasted four minutes, you know the most stupid set of words that you are ever going to know. The issue really isn't memory here, but I want to say that you know twenty words forward and backward. You know them from any place in the story, forward and backward. If we had a little time to practice it a couple of times--here's the worst thing--you'd know them forever. If I found you on the street in five years, you could go: "Paper, carpet, door, bottle...." And the issue is that we believe so much, in our culture, in the learner as the problem. The end problem. Sorry you couldn't get it. We have defined *dyslexia*, but we have yet to understand *dysteachia*.

What does it mean when the strategy I used didn't work for you and you go on believing it's you. In the first example, you could have believed, if I had been a little bit more persuasive, you might believe that you belonged in the fish group. If I also told the story, "You know, I did this yesterday in Washington, DC, and everyone in the audience knew them all." You see the comparative stuff starts: "Oh no, someone might be better than me. I might really be stupid." And then we start the incredible hiding we do from one another. Admitting we don't know how. We pose and say things like, "I didn't want to memorize anyway. I don't even like memorizing. Those are stupid words. Stupid. I don't like it." And we begin that process.

Where, if we were in a classroom that said, "What if we cooperated with it, what if we tried some new strategies, and the strategy we used happened to be a memory strategy where we were storing using both sides? All of our knowing, all of the senses. And we were as weird as possible, we strung them all together because that happens to be one of the senior strategies for memory." But I'm saying what we do with kids is that we already expect them to know how to memorize. To already know how to multiply. We'll give you a little sample, and if you don't know it, whatever. Our whole culture is set up that way. Where if we did this: music, movement, excitement, no failure, these sort of things....If you can believe it, you can achieve it. High expectation. I not only know that you can twenty words, and I mean this from the bottom of my heart, if we'd stand here together in the sweat from having done that aerobics, for another say ten minutes, you would have a hundred words you could do that way. And in fact, we probably can't max out. We know someone has tried five thousand, who'd want to? In other words, my belief system about you is very high, but I also provide a strategy to make it simple. That's the part of breakthrough we have missed. To be in a learning organization, a group, that believes in itself and knows it can, is absolutely fundamental to taking the risk it takes to learning. I think that's some of what we've missed.

PETER SENGE: Why don't we take a couple minutes. You can spin your chairs around and chat with a couple people around you. And here is the question I'd like to ask you: What do you think is a principle that was illustrated by that little game we just went through? There's not just one, there's actually a few. Particularly, what's that principle that you could begin to imagine? How could it be an impact in a schoolroom or school? Just take a couple minutes, just checking with each other, you can do this with the person next to you. Just turn your chairs around so there are three or four of you chatting. I'm only going to give you about two or three minutes and then I'm going to interrupt you.

***

PETER SENGE: Certain basic elements, I won't bother repeating as I think we have said some of them already, cooperation, every one is a learner, and then supporting teachers in developing strategies to enact that. And it's the strategy that matters and Sue's said that comment at the end.

PARTICIPANT: Is it the responsibility of the professional to have in their bag particular strategies to get the outcome they desire? Because we already know how to educate everybody but you the educator.

PETER SENGE: I couldn't hear the last part of what you said. You said because we already know how to educate everyone we choose to educate. And the first part of what he said, the responsibility of professionals to have knowledge of certain basic strategies that can be brought into play. One or two more.

PARTICIPANT: The first model, is a learner and I fell off the ship of learning, I drifted or drowned. In the second model, a lot of life rafts were thrown out to me so I could get back on the boat and learn with the rest of the people in the class.

PARTICIPANT: We should utilize all the tools and resources available, music for example really added a lot....

PETER SENGE: And for some it's vital.

PARTICIPANT: In the first, the teacher saw herself as an expert. In the second, she saw herself as a fellow learner. She was learning something from the students.

PETER SENGE: To be a learner is to be a little foolish, isn't it? I'd like to make a connection, if I can, between the first comment about the authoritarian system and the second. When you think about it, what does it mean to be a learner? See what I mean? A learner doesn't know. To be a learner, is to be in a state of not knowing. To be a little foolish. To be a little silly. Now different people will express that in their own way. It doesn't mean that everyone has the same way of expressing it, but what we have found again and again, and I suspect many of you have found, that the first great obstacle that one confronts--and I think this comes right back to the point Dr. Deming was making repeatedly earlier this morning--the absolute essential role, as he put it, for individual transformation. The first big obstacle that one confronts is that there is something deeply embedded in our system of education that says it's about experts, and everybody has to be an expert in their domain. Which is the antithesis of learning. I mean, learning advances in some sense from knowledge base but it also advances. To be a learner is to not know. To be at ease with that state of not knowing. That's not easy for teachers.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Also building on what Dr. Deming said this morning, we were talking about some of the systems that are normally in place that would have destroyed the possibility for the teamwork of cooperation, such as the curve, the grading curve. And the fish verses the other animals. She could not have accomplished that without a supportive environment.

PETER SENGE: To allow her to create a different system in the classroom. Right? Good.

PARTICIPANT: And along with that you have to wonder what it was that would cause a teacher to do the things she did in the first example.

PETER SENGE: I'll repeat it. Did you have any more you wanted to add? He said, along with that you'd have to wonder what it is that would cause the teacher to do what the teacher did in the first example. See, that's the kind of question that always keeps you stepping back and asking about the system. It is so easy to say, boy, we got rid of those teachers, right? And we will just get a new bunch of folks in who will be operating on the same system and will operate the same way. It's not chance. It's not coincidence. It's some deeper level cause, but we don't fully understand the causes. It's not simple. It's not trivial. One more and then I want to go on.

PARTICIPANT: Two of the causes, the first teaching style resonated with us as what we had experienced ourselves at school, and secondly suspect that the reward system in place today can be the same.

PETER SENGE: So the reward system in place today is still the one by and large you're suggesting will encourage the first style.

SUE MILLER-HURST: A quick story. I did this before an audience that happened to be in Beverly Hills. A man came up afterwards, tears in his eyes, and I think he's talking about his child. He's having trouble articulating, and he is sort of sobbing. We wait together until he feels like talking, and I said, "Is it your child?" He said, "No, it's me." He could hardly get it out. He said, "This is the first day of my life that I realized that it wasn't me." He is a director in Hollywood, or producer, I don't know remember which. I'm just suggesting that we carry with us this deep pain, even if we think we are pretty successful. So that is an important story that we are holding, and we have to release that to get to our next story.

ENID BROWN: My ten-year-old is in a class like the first one, and I would like to share that, that school has won a national award for excellence. They have some of the highest test scores, and have demonstrated evidence of achievement that is very impressive. That's what I'm worried about, suspicious learning that Bill Scherkenbach mention because they are not doing the right things.

PETER SENGE: OK, let me suggest to you a couple different ways we can proceed here. The first step is to throw ourselves into the middle of this thing, as I suggested earlier. We are all part of it, we really are. We've all grown up in the system which we can say, in some generality, ought to be changed. We have to first put ourselves into it to begin getting back in touch with what it felt like. You know, I don't know about you, but I've always been deeply perplexed and troubled by those statistics about the likelihood of parents who grow up as abused children being abusive parents. It's obviously not because parents espouse that. But it's a system they know, and it becomes intertwined with our own perceptual apparatus, our own ways of defining problems, our own ways of reacting to situations. We are all in it. We really are like the fish sitting around imagining what it would be like to be out of water. There is a certain humility that we have to start with.

***

RICK MORRISON: If we could all just gather our seats we can begin right away. I must commend all of you at the timely fashion that we've handled and dealt with all the segues of the day's events. I'm going to ask Stephanie Pace-Marshall to join us. I said it a little earlier, but I'm going to repeat myself. I must say in light of the start of the morning and with the various corridors we have hustled you all through, I certainly want to extend my appreciation for you for allowing us to do so. We come now to the preliminary findings and recommendations of each of the three panels and I'd like to begin that by introducing our moderator for the day, Mr. Tom Toch.

TOM TOCH: We have about forty-five minutes for this section of the program, maybe about forty-five minutes to an hour. I think what we would like to do is take about five minutes to hear a brief summary from each of the group leaders and then have a fifteen minute discussion open to everyone by way of follow-up. So I would first like to ask Stephanie Pace-Marshall to come up and give us a brief synopsis of her group's discussion. They were looking at the issue of designing a model learning community.

STEPHANIE PACE-MARSHALL: Thank you, Tom. In order to get some consensus on definition, we agreed with Peter's framework of learning organization as an organization that enhances the capacity of individuals and the aggregation of individuals to create and to shape their own future. We agreed that was a very generic definition, that part of our task as a group was to put some specificity to that and try to create or paint a picture of what a learning organization or learning community would look like, primarily from the perspective of school or school system. We had some difficulty with structuring that, and I want to force a kind of arbitrary structure to help just in presenting some of the ideas that we did come up with. In addition to trying to give some constructs for a learning community, we also had the question on what gets in the way, what are the obstacles, and what kinds of things might we do to overcome those obstacles. We looked at a framework, at the end. We really talked about some critical dimensions of a learning community, and then I kind of forced it into a framework which I hope will be useful, and if not we can throw it out. But essentially we looked at organizational decision-making structures and leadership. We looked at articulation within and between systems. We looked at accountability. We looked at preparation of teachers and educators, staff development, curriculum and learning goals, instructional strategies, assessment and resource allocation, and had a little bit to say in most of those categories, although I think the group would agree that we had just really begun the conversation.

In terms of organizational development and leadership, we focused on the construct of empowerment--that we are turning the organizational structure upside down. We need to look at team structures and team building within the organization and within the leadership dimensions of the organization.

In terms of articulation we really talked about the fact that this is not a linear system, that we are talking about subsystems, within the system called school or school district, and that they interface with other kinds of systems, which Joe's group will talk about. We talked about a broad base of learner needs in terms of health, family, education, and child care as articulation in the system.

In terms of accountability we talked about the need to reward problem solving and reward questioning.

In terms of preparation of teachers, we talked about the fact that one of the things we do not learn in schools is the notion of interdependence, and that teachers--and all of us--do not understand systems and the notion of interdependence and that has to be part of preparatory programs.

We talked a lot about staff development, the changing and evolving role of the teacher, their enhanced role in curriculum design and development, and their role, really, as mentors and coaches in the cognitive development of each child.

In terms of curriculum and learner goals, we were all over the map. We said that curriculum must be based on research and development. We talked about curriculum frameworks. We talked about the need to cultivate and develop literacy and numeracy, although we did not really define or explain what that was. We also left the notion of curriculum frameworks, and really started talking about the knowledge and information. Then we said we really need to foster inquiry as learning goals. We have to make sure our curriculum is driven by questions.

In terms of learning goals themselves, we talked about optimizing the development of children, social competence, generative knowledge, students posing questions and problems, and character and ethical development.

In terms of instruction, we picked up on some of the work Sue did this morning, and looked at cooperation and learning, flexibility in reaching individual goals, and making sure that instructional strategies are designed to enable the learners and to enhance cognitive growth and development.

Assessment. We looked at problem solving.

So essentially, we began trying to fill in and paint a picture of what some of the components of the system might be. In terms of what gets in the way or obstacles, we had several. School is custodial and not educational. School is typically used to rate, rank, and order people. Americans do not value scholarship. Schools are used to maintain the social order and maintain the bifurcations of Haves and Have-nots; that people are unwilling to change. That education, right now, is perceived to be of little value. That we have discomfort in risk. That we don't understand change. That the current government structures (i.e., boards) are political and competitive. That we do not believe that all children can learn and can be educated. That there is a systemic knowledge deprivation of educators; we simply do not know enough. Even though we have a theoretical base, we haven't learned how to integrate that theoretical base with pedagogy. We are not aware of the knowledge that we need to have in terms of instruction. That our profession is devalued. That there is a lack of partnership within other systems. And that there is a national lack of consensus about what the role of education should be. To name just a few of the obstacles in our way.

We didn't really get to overcoming those obstacles, although we said that people need to understand interdependence. They need to understand integration. We need to provide a lot more work in understanding systems and wholes. And also, we need to make sure that people have the knowledge to operationalize the theoretical base that we already have.

TOM TOCH: In my business, the question from the editor would be, pretty quickly, where is your lead? By way of supplying that for the next ten or fifteen minutes, it seemed to me that one of the most important points that came out of that session, and I happened to sit in on it, was the point that several people made that you cannot have a learning community, or a model learning community, unless there is a shared mission, among all those who are participating in that learning environment or have an effect on it, as a shared sense of what that school, that learning environment, should be. So it seems to me that it would be helpful to explore, and I'll urge you to volunteer to examine in a little bit more depth what are the impediments to defining a shared mission within a school system, within a public school system, currently. I know some of you know, because two or three of you gave me examples. What are the impediments to generating a shared mission in our schools? What forces are at work in public education that make it difficult for a group of educators to agree or community to agree on what their school should be and do?

PARTICIPANT: One of the problems is not wanting to take the time to do it. I think the mistakes that businesses have made of going off for a weekend retreat, then coming back and explaining to everybody, and getting them to sign off on it. One of the biggest impediments is not understanding that it takes a long time to develop a shared mission and vision. You are looking at three to five years to go through that process of getting it out there before it is operational.

TOM TOCH: What is that process? How do you do it?

PARTICIPANT: The first answer is one of involvement by invitation. There is no block step process. It has happened a lot of ways.

Some people have brought everybody in and involved them from the beginning. Some other people have worked from the top of the small core, and then invited people to review and input into it, and said can you accept this? Is this what you think we are about? It's a matter of involvement and asking people. Whichever way you go about it.

TOM TOCH: Is that an easy thing to do in our schools? To generate the time and opportunities for our educators to buy in, if you will?

PARTICIPANT: Time is a huge issue and I think to many educators themselves. I think there are far too many who sit there and say, why bother? To participate in that dialogue, I think becomes another question. Governance special interest groups, people who come there to foster one agenda item, and they're not going to let anything else be included on that plate. I see them as impediments.

TOM TOCH: Are the special interests, the single agenda voices, *outside* of the school, imposing their agenda on the schools, or are these interest groups within the school system?

PARTICIPANT: My view is that the tendency for them to come from outside to the extent that I divide between those who are working in schools versus others who either participate in the school or have a tremendous interest. For example, special ed parents.

PARTICIPANT: The shared vision now for the majority of Americans is the school they went to. That is, the shared vision of what the school should be.

TOM TOCH: Right. And further, it seems to me, when I look at public schools in this country, they do many other things, and they're expected, urged to do many other things than simply educate kids. So you have, it seems to me, a tension between the academic mission of the school, which we all, I think in this room, take for granted, and the role of intercollegiate athletics, etc., etc. Does that prove to be a problem in defining a shared mission?

PARTICIPANT: The gentleman over here described a way to create a mission statement. There is no one way to do this. There are others who feel that's a hoax, that public education is supposed to help all kids be successful learners--that's our mission. But the real time, the real effort must be spent allowing teachers, principals in rural schools, parents as well. What does success look like? And how can we make that happen? The key thing is time. In terms of a lot of groups having issues about that, there are the issues of child care; there are issues of paying teachers to come together; there are issues school.... what does that look like? But in studies that have been done about schools in making

98

a difference, is bringing teachers and principals together with parents about the issues of what does it mean to be successful.

TOM TOCH: But it seems to me in public education, we spend tremendous money, billions of dollars, on staff development. Are we not using that money well?

PARTICIPANTS: Less than one percent. We don't. There isn't money.

PARTICIPANT: One of things that I am hearing here is time may be a factor, shared vision may be a factor, but I think I heard one word in this gentleman's statement that really creates the biggest impediment. When you start talking about making all the children successful, that's where you run into problems because some people have agendas that only support certain children. We cannot begin to talk about educating all children until we really begin looking at what each one of us thinks education is supposed to do, period.

TOM TOCH: So, how do you accomplish that?

PARTICIPANT: It is going to take a lot more than this meeting. I think that one of the things that we need to begin looking at is the role of the mass media, also, and understand that people are socialized to think differently about certain people and certain groups of people, and about certain children. We need to understand that there is institutional racism, if you will, there is systemic discrimination even in our schools and we need to understand and until we are really able to look at that as the real problem and make certain that educators, or at least those that come into the profession, understand that we are talking about all kids and not any select few. We are really going to have a major problem. So, I think we've got to start by understanding how we are all socialized in this country and make some attempts to change that.

TOM TOCH: Bill Honig.

BILL HONIG: Let me begin by saying that in this nation, every youngster born into this nation, or every youngster living in this nation, is entitled to a quality education, and you make that education an entitlement and not a public charity where one day we give and the next day we don't.

PETER SENGE: I think that one of the issues you have to face is how do you help this discussion or dialogue at the local school level? Assuming that we've gone through setting goals and setting missions, everybody has done that, but if you want to make that operational you've got to help that process along. You can help in a variety of ways. You can help it by giving more need and definition by what do you mean by quality. If you want a kid to be scientifically literate, or to think, or be able to communicate, or be a life-long learner, what does that look like? How do you help staffs think about that issue?

TOM TOCH: In fact, that is what is going on nationwide, by way of efforts to develop national curriculum standards in a national examination.

PARTICIPANT: National curriculum is not going to mean anything unless we figure out a way of communicating that to a local staff in a usable fashion. That is the missing link. You could have standards, but they don't mean anything if you can't make them operational. Secondly, let's take the first step, we want to focus on our science program, we don't do anything that is too weak. Somebody should think through, how do you want to beef up your science program. What are the questions you should ask yourself? What should we look at? What kind of help can we give you? Have visions of how others have done that. Who organizes that type of technical support and training for staffs that want to go through that. You said spend that money on staff development. It is not staff development that's focus is systemic. Change, and a lot of it pain-free, creates that--having nothing to do with evaluation and staff development. What it is, a lot of it, is off target. The question has to do with, how do you make this operational at a site level? How do you put it in that context? That's where people should be paying attention. Look at all the questions here; we all tend to rise right up to the chair with these big pronouncements, but what do I do with the standards saying that all kids compete? Even if all kids could learn, which is a good statement, a powerful statement, what does that mean when you look at the data for this school? College attendance, drop-out rates, who takes the right courses, who's enrolled in AP courses? All those kinds of questions are the technical help you need to help them get through.

TOM TOCH: So one solution here, if we are talking about solutions, is to rethink what resources we do allocate for the training and retraining of our teachers currently in the work force.

PARTICIPANT: I have to speak from the PTA's point of view.

TOM TOCH: Are you with the PTA?

PARTICIPANT: I think there is a distinction drawn to the community of parents of this goal setting and decision making that goes on. And we have been told that those great national goals have been developed by the administration and the governors were developed without parents. If you are going to succeed in any movement in this country with improving education, you've got to improve parents. It's time-consuming, granted, and you will risk bringing in what you might call fringe groups or special interest groups, but my feeling is that any good administrator today better know how to handle that. Unless you can demonstrate that you have all segments of your community involved in setting those goals and improving education you're not going to make it, because if we're looking to have a strong buy-into public education in this country, which is what we are all about, then we have to put in that broader community because only 23% of the parents in this country, they have kids but no schools. Who are we going to depend on to support our public education?

TOM TOCH: Right, I think your broader definition of a learning community is one that most people would appreciate.

PARTICIPANT: I want to add one more component to the learning community, which are the students. I think, they themselves have a lot to teach us about what works in schools. I don't know if there are any students here today who could speak to that. Students who have just graduated from schools, they know about a lot of these issues and they experience them firsthand. Fortunately those of us who are here can help them frame the issues.

TOM TOCH: Fair enough. We need to move on. I would just like to make one observation. We are talking here, primarily, about schools and the way in which school staffs together with their parent constituents and student constituents, organize themselves, commit themselves to a particular mission. One reality I think that is often lost, is that there is a tremendous amount of turnover from school to school in this country among the staff. And furthermore, the individual schools themselves have very little say, and in most instances none, about who joins the staff at their school. That is a consequence of tradition and union regulations. But it seems to me that unless we address these nuts and bolts organizational issues in schools, that our efforts to generate these broader goals such as a shared mission within a school are going to be slowed dramatically.

The second session was facilitated by Joe Sensenbrenner. Its task was discussing the subject of creating an environment in which the new school thrives.

JOE SENSENBRENNER: This might be helpful, in a little bit, defining what our group was working on. The first group was working on what is *it*, what are some of the parameters of a school itself. Our group dealt a little more with that amorphous environment. What are the kinds of supportive things around that school district, or that fairly localized delivery system, that we need to develop some more definition of? In group three they looked at this more in a time sequence: What can we learn? What kinds of processes, sequences and mechanisms can we enable to reflect on what we learn as these things are developed? So our focus was primarily that environment that surrounds the school itself, working off of group one.

For the members of group one, group two and group three used a process which we learned and then applied. The process is one where each person had a number of ideas. Those ideas were clustered, and then the top of those clusters were given what's called a header. Something that sums up the group in that list. And what I am going to report are the headers from two different groups. They were in the same session but we simply divided ourselves in half. First, I'll report simply the headers and some of the discussion around those headers, and then some of the reflection that we ourselves had on the work that we did.

From group one, the largest header was "The Stakeholders" need to be operating from the same language base; that the various constituent parts needed to understand what it was a lot better. I think this was reflected in the discussion we just heard and the work of group one. That was by far the most important issue that the group dealt with. And the focus question for our group was, what are the issues in creating an environment in which the new school thrives? What are the issues in creating that kind of environment? So the first one was the stakeholders need to be operating from the same knowledge base. The second one was, "There needs to be support from all stakeholders to all other stakeholders." That was expressed that there needs to be considerable information exchanged. There needs to be money and resources made available to carry on this work. Another phrase that was in the group was, we need to support people that go out on a limb. The third largest in that group was "All children are entitled to a quality education," and also had as a major feature, expecting a major role from the federal government. There was some discussion about the concept of children, and I think the group after the discussion meant to enlarge that to learners, or people who are in the community that wish to access learning for life.

Our second group, had as its largest area of concern, the role and responsibility of parents, businesses, and community. How to more clearly define their necessary involvement and have them understand that involvement? Another large category was a common vision for the stakeholders, a theme that emerged from the first groups work. The first header was framed shared governess and supporting training. There was a lot of discussion around the term governess and the concept of administration control and decision making all being modified by the word shared concepts that were discussed back and forth. And lastly in that group, was supportive legislation and adequate funding.

We then looked at the work that we had done and talked with each other about that work. Some additional comments, sort of supplementing the work were: who bears the ultimate responsibility to get the political environment, business and governance together? That was the theme, who bears that responsibility? Secondarily, that the community role is essential. That was one of the strongest themes of the work that we did. That there is a national role that is necessary. That individual districts, which have very different funding bases, can't be expected to carry the load. There was an observation by someone who was familiar with using this technique that the group did very good work, but that more time would of been very helpful, simply because there were a lot of issues that we couldn't get to in the time we had.

Then the group was a little more reflective. Looking at the issues that had been identified and the work that had been done, there were a couple of comments. One, we were not pushing the envelope and we were relying too much on the federal government. These were ideas that came up again and again. We weren't stretching at this discussion. Another comment, an individual had been in this business for twenty-two years and there's not one new thing on that list; we're replowing the same territory. Then there was a suggestion that maybe the discussion could have been more focused, more beneficial if the question had been, "What are the barriers?" What are the limits on us moving forward on these areas? And we could have focused our discussion on overcoming those barriers. One of the last comments was that the issue of getting a clear, as Deming put it this morning, *aim* is just critical. The person indicated that they talked to a number of leaders in the education area, and each of them had given a different definition of, "What is the purpose of the school?" What is this thing that we are trying to make better and the need for us to get more and more clear on that vision, on what is it that we are pushing for.

That is a brief summary, and I'd first welcome the people in my group if they want to supplement or amplify my brief summary.

PARTICIPANT: We touched on that other central question of How? You have indicated that group three was dealing more with the how of all of that.

JOE SENSENBRENNER: Our group wanted to get into that area. We could have spent time on that but that was generally the province of the third group, but our group recognized the desire to go there. Other supplements or amplifications from the group?...Good. Thank you.

TOM TOCH: It seems to me that two themes that come out of Deming's work have resonated the most today so far. That is the notion of cooperation, and secondly the idea of intrinsic motivation. How do we get the stakeholders, to use the phrase that has been going around, how do we get the people involved, committed? How do we get them invested? So it seems to me, that it would be useful to explore, just briefly, how we do generate cooperation at a school site and within a school system, but primarily at the school site. How do we generate this sense of cooperation that Dr. Deming insists is crucial?

PARTICIPANT: I'm an educator and not too familiar with Dr. Deming's work. At the risk of being a little bit negative, how can one begin to talk about cooperation, if you don't know what you are cooperating for? I would support what the second group came up with as being the aim, as being very significant and an important issue; until you know what that aim is, then what are you doing? You are going to be drifting around in circles. I've worked for many companies, large and small, some of them in manufacturing, plenty of them happen to be in service which is your business if you want a service kind of an industry. These companies all have the same kind of intrinsic problems. The same basic problem, they don't know where they are going. They'd love to get there. They'd love to have some quick way of getting there. They'd love to have magic formulas. I can tell you folks, all of the work that I have seen, that one of the bases of that magic formula is that it has to come from the top. And one of the things that I have not been able to discover yet in the school system is, what is the top? I have not been able to figure out whether this is local government, state government, federal government, or local school board.

--THUNDER--

TOM TOCH: That was from the very top and don't you doubt it.

PARTICIPANT (continued): I think what you have to consider here is you're putting the cart before the horse.

TOM TOCH: Well, I think you are reiterating the point that several people have made, and that is that the idea that a shared mission is an important prerequisite to further discussion, and I think that you see on the educational landscape in this country at this moment, an effort to define what that mission is, to get agreement on what that schools should be doing from the very top, in a sense that we are developing national curriculum standards in a national examination system.

PARTICIPANT: A mission is a judgement call that must be made by the management above the organization. What is the management of education?

TOM TOCH: But you've answered your own question. In this country, the ultimate say over who teaches what, and what the purpose of schools is, works its way up the ladder. We've gotten to the point to a unprecedented extent and, as they do in Japan, it is at the national level that consensus is emerging over what should be done in education.

PARTICIPANT: I do believe that it is going to take a whole community to educate the child. And I strongly support the idea that we have to have a common language because truly, businesses and educators do not talk the same language.

TOM TOCH: That's clear.

PARTICIPANT: We need the help of everyone.

TOM TOCH: Right.

PARTICIPANT: I do not applaud the training group. A good portion falls in a session in which school board focus, superintendents, principals, teachers, and PTA are learning the systems of thinking. You are exploring an issue from systems thinking. Let me give an example of what you just were saying earlier about, isn't there a lot of money spent on staff development and where the entire audience chuckled.

TOM TOCH: But then Bill Honig refuted what you said.

PARTICIPANT: You need to walk in our shoes. We need to walk in your shoes. And by having different groups together in the school board in the State Department of Education, we will walk in one of their shoes. We left there as a cohesive group, collaborated and got around and dealt with some of these issues, and we could then spend more time on really addressing the issues of, again, all kids as successful learners. We left with that. That was our mission. That was as good as a cross section of American education in public as you could get. But we learned how to dialogue. We learned to challenge our mental models, to take risks, and to work together. I don't know if those are all the right things but I am here today because of that. It was very powerful and I'd like to see this group work together like that.

PARTICIPANT: I think what was powerful about what the gentleman just said, was what he didn't say. He didn't mention the word school, and it has been very interesting to me that I think at least half the time if I'm keeping track accurately, when people have made comments they've referred to what appears to be a building or at most a cluster of buildings, in what we know as a school district. I guess it has a taxpaying entity that defines it. I think the issue is, what is the system we are trying to influence? We have very little understanding of that. Most of the initiatives going on have to do with tampering in pieces of the system, they aren't systemic changes.

TOM TOCH: What is a systemic change in your definition?

PARTICIPANT: Well, I think one example of a systemic change was Head Start. It was a fundamental intervention, major intervention, in the system of education so that children would be able to learn.

TOM TOCH: It was a specific program and designed to do a specific thing.

I'd love to hear from some teachers about the ways in which schools could become more cooperative institutions and the impediments to cooperation. This is where rubber meets the road in education, it seems to me.

PARTICIPANT: Before I answer this question I asked earlier, how many of you in here in September, go into the classroom and stay in there for the next 185 days? Classroom teachers. That helps me;

I read the audience right. I wanted to go back to your first question, what are the impediments to change? I know that I am out of order but I didn't get called on before. From a classroom teacher's standpoint, the major impediment to change is the schools that now exist as primarily ritual and symbolic. We work comfortably with that. We know how that works. And my worst fear is that people won't be patient enough with the idea of quality, assuming that it has some basis, and after November, you are going to see the issue slip away, slip away, slip away. Now, before you discount my credibility entirely, I want you to understand that thirty years ago when I started teaching, my principal put me in a room with thirty kids, five hours a day, and gave me about two bucks a kid for a book. I've had four years of the education president. Next fall, I will go into my class, there will be five sections, roughly thirty students, and I'll have about two bucks a kid. My second worst fear, is that people, despite all the words that they say, really like it this way.

PARTICIPANT: How much more people permitted in the last ten years of education? How much more dollars? I mean billion of dollars in the nation. More than it was ten years ago.

PARTICIPANT: Let's talk about commitment other than money. Let's talk about commitment and time. How much time do we spend in terms of increased school base, of increased staff development that teaches over the summer. How much more do our students study today than they did in 1970? Does anybody believe that our kids are genetically inferior to other kids throughout the world? The average American high school kid works very, very hard, but not on school work. He has a part-time job, he plays football. Now if I went back to my board of education tomorrow and said we're going to play all our football games on Saturday, no more sports except on Fridays and Saturdays, I'd have to write my resume that afternoon. The reality of the situation is, this gentleman is right. We have delivered to the American public what they wanted. What they're comfortable with. A low stress, easy answer, high school education.

***

TOM TOCH: My initial question is,how do we create a stronger sense of community within schools?. I don't think we have addressed that issue adequately yet and I think that there are a number of specific things that could be done.

PARTICIPANT: First of all, there is a certain war, and all of us have been exposed to this quality mentality, which is the war of the last decade, the bonfire of the vanities with this magic of industry and major participants. We have, of course, put on some of the trappings on the field. This isn't a company, this is called a country. The capitalistic interpretation and democratic interpretation are in fact economist. We are trying to run democracy, which in fact empowers multiple visions. In this democracy, we have not, and never perhaps will, come to a consensus on what this nation is about. It is messy. It is bad systems. We will probably never come to this neat consensual vision of what the schools are going to do. As long as we are comfortable with accepting the multiple definitions, we are probably not part of what constitutes America. If we go to something else then maybe we are into America, Inc. I think that there is a lot of people looking for America Incorporated.

TOM TOCH: That is a fair point, but if we take Mr. Deming's argument at face value, it does seem to me that we have to find ways of generating a stronger sense of community, a sense of cooperation, at some level. Because without a shared mission, the consensus seems to be, and certainly Mr. Deming argued this, there is no way of getting all the oars in the water pulling together and there is very little opportunity to really systematically address what you want to accomplish...This will have to be the last word. I'm sorry.

PARTICIPANT: As a system of reform, introducing private school market choice for primary, elementary, and secondary education would certainly answer one of Mr. Deming's questions and that is, what is worse than the airlines?

TOM TOCH: Our third session was facilitated by Peter Senge. That group was addressing the issue of advancing the Deming agenda to the next level.

PETER SENGE: Could I take just a moment to respond to some of the questions right at the very end, and then I'm going to use our panel. This business about mission--and I think you're continually pushing in an area that really is important--doesn't have any simple answer but I think it would be a real mistake to not to keep pushing at it, which is what would it mean to move toward some shared vision, some shared mission. What I want to do is just offer a couple of very simple observations that have been enormously helpful for me working with organizations, not just business, to sort out a underlying dilemma. You pointed to it, I'm sorry I don't know your name. John. There is a big difference between mission and vision. We use these words interchangeably and actually when we do that we fail to make distinctions that are very practical distinctions to make. Mission has to do with reason for being. What's the reason for being? I'm not a big fan of definitive mission statements because I think we are in the domain of poetry, it's hard to discuss purpose and words. However, you can sort of point at it. I like very much the statement that was made over here, you know, the mission is to create an environment where all children can discover their capacity as learners. I mean I'm sure we could come up with a lot of different phrasings that would be in that same general territory. I actually do find it a little hard to imagine a significant coming together without some sense of shared mission. I think that trying to push on that, Tom, is appropriate.

On the other hand, vision is quite different than mission, vision answers the question, what are we trying to create? That's different than why do we exist. When we make that distinction sharply, then we can actually have a situation, and I've seen again and again and again, where a large, very diverse group of people can have a shared sense of purpose and yet be pursuing quite distinct visions. And in fact the task of management, if you will, really the task of leadership is to continually develop some degree of harmony between the multiplicity of visions which can, and in my experience always, exist in a creative environment against a backdrop of some common sense of mission. So that distinction, when I hear the words used very sloppily without definition, without distinction, then it makes it very hard to achieve some headway between where we need to try to achieve some commonality and where we do indeed need to foster multiplicity. We don't need a shared vision for education in America if we use my definition, what are we trying to achieve. It is absolutely appropriate, and I cannot consider any other possibility than individual schools, maybe even school systems, I'm not even sure about that, coming together around some shared sense of vision that makes sense to them and where they can really invest themselves. Because ultimately it's not what the vision is, it's what the vision does. If the vision hooks peoples genuine commitment, their creativity...

PARTICIPANT: I get *mission*. Give me an example of *vision*.

PETER SENGE: Vision is: what are we trying to achieve? In other words, paint a picture for me of what this place would look like. I'll give you the one that I just happen to know about, I'm not saying that this is the right way to do it. But one school I've been associated with, their vision is about systems thinking, what they call learner directed learning. That is what they are trying to do. They are trying to prove that you can put a middle school together based on systems thinking and learner directed learning. They fleshed out a whole bunch of measures or indicators that they are making headway.

PARTICIPANT: Your hope is that you want to get kids to learn the qualities, you know the qualities whatever they are. It's not the mission but it's the vision, here is how we are going to do it.

PETER SENGE: The mission I think is to them, I would probably say, something more like we want to create an environment where all children are continually developing their capacity to learn. And we have an idea of what we specifically want to do. See, that distinction is so important for finding some balance between this timeless issue, and this is a timeless issue, how communities achieve some commonality and yet foster the diversity needed for people to be genuinely committed. You know, people are never committed to somebody else's vision. Never. You know, commitment comes from pursuing your own dream. So you get smaller groups of people coming together around that and that's why the one other thing that brings them clear is: the real task of management or leadership is, again as I say, to continually manage processes of developing harmony between the multiplicity of visions which should exist. There is never an end state. You never get there. You're always continually working on, now what are they doing? Gee, is everybody fired up about that. Are they missing something important? You see, it's just this continual questioning process. I just want to make that distinction because I have heard this conversation for twenty years. It is very easy to get confused around these issues when you don't make the simple definitional distinctions.

Now, I would like to introduce my group. And I would like my group to do the reporting. We chose the following question. The question was: what are the issues involved in learning from our learning in transforming America's schools? What are the issues involved in learning from our learning in transforming schools? Now, let me just clarify the phrasing to be a little bit less confusing to people. The kind of territory we are talking about here, is that there is no shortage of individual examples of extraordinary breakthrough and innovation. There are plenty of examples of it. One of the big issues in this field is that most of those examples don't spread. You can come back to a place that was a tremendous source of innovation and excitement and five years later and find that it has all gone down the tubes. One or two people have left. Or you can find one setting where something is really going on and it almost seems to polarize, everybody seems to take their task, how can we prove that the first group was wrong? Or, couldn't possibly be done here, right? So this whole area of diffusion, how we learn from our learning was the general area we were exploring.

Now, what I would like to do, is just have the folks who actually, what we did was the same process that group two followed wherein we had groups sort of think about this individually, start to put up their individual ideas, and then we had people come together and try to begin synthesizing what came out of their group of ten or twelve people. So, what I would like to do is invite the people who were synthesizers, what we called the headers, for each of those groups, to say a few words about what their group came out with. We have the results from the different groups over here in a flip chart. There are two types of information that are captured here. By the way, this is a very rough cut first pass in this process. There is a lot more that we didn't do. What we did do here is, just begin to coalesce the different views that people are expressing. Begin to come up with some labels to capture the groupings, then tabulated which groupings had the most statements, the most issues. Just a very, very, rough copy, first piece of data as to which of the areas that most people seem to be most concerned with. We had three separate groups. So there are going to be three different reports. Whose one was this? Why don't you both come up. All we are asking for here is a quick report on what the results were and any reflections that you or other members of your group might like to make on the process.

PARTICIPANT: First of all, this is what we get for having birthdays in September.

PARTICIPANT: One, was challenge regularities. A number of people threw in that we've got to go, like at General Electric, they have challenged junk work. They tried to say what report, what approval, what meeting, what measurement, what policy, don't we need to do, any longer. So, it was trying to find out what things that we do, as teachers or as students, and listen to people and find out, do we need to do it? Because only by doing that, can we have the time to be creative and innovative.

PARTICIPANT: We have a couple here that are related though they were significantly posted, stick-ums under each one. One is called "Sharing What We Learn." The other one is, "Networks Must Communicate and Cooperate." Essentially both of those fall under the category of not operating in isolation but rather sharing what we have learned as learners. Basic philosophy, we have a number of different educational networks at work, throughout the country. We also have great learning going on in individual schools and school districts. Part of the problem is we don't talk to each other, and we don't hear about our learners. So, both of these groups clustered under the whole concept of sharing and researching and communicating and cooperating with one another.

PARTICIPANT: Another one was, "Celebrate the Schools as Communities of Learners" and this is life-long learners and it really ties on with sharing it with the families, finding what we can do, what the students can take home. This is called affinity charting or mind mapping, which is the way our kids are doing their homework. Be able to get parents at the dining room table to have the sharing of the learning there too. Make it more family valued.

PARTICIPANT: This one was entitled "Develop Staff." The list of post-its there ran all the way from staff development and all the billions of dollars we're spending on staff development in our own individual school districts right up through, or down through, the preparation of teachers. All of the staff development stick-ums had a single goal in mind and that is the development of teachers *prior* to their teaching experience and the continuing development of teachers *after* they become teachers.

PARTICIPANT: "Media Failure" OK. I think we have to get the acknowledgement that Aristotle said when you want a smart answer you have to ask a dumb question. We have to get past the idea that in third grade, when we raised our hand and we said something that was wrong or didn't get the homework assignment right, the teacher looked at someone else and said, "Give me the right answer, Johnny." We've got to realize as adults that most of the transitions in our life occurred at times of failure. As far as for our children, having failure, throwing out answers that are the dumb questions, as Aristotle said, might get those smart answers.

PARTICIPANT: We are running out of time. Let me take the last two. One of them is "Building Assessment." In other words, assessment becomes an integral part of the program rather than an adjunct to the program. The other one is "Gain Public Support." Once we have learned what it is that we are doing; once we have learned what works and what doesn't work, then we go sell it and gain public support.

PETER SENGE: Those two, building assessment and gain public support, were the ones that had the most comments on them. Right? I want to hustle you guys off just because we are short of time. Thank you very much. Could we hear from the second group? Can you whip us through these in about two or three minutes? I know it's quick, but particularly emphasize the ones that seemed to gain the most focus.

PARTICIPANT: The most focus was on the area of dissemination of information, not only to an isolated group of professionals, but to the whole community. And that the whole community has a common understanding of what they're about. "Time and Structure for Training." If we are going to go through this massive transformation, it's going to take time, it's going to take organization, and it's going to have to be provided for. It can't be done without resources and the most valuable resource is time. "The System Is Transformed not Merely Changed," that was the next noticed, frequented header. I think that's a theme that ran through a number of comments. What is the difference between tinkering with the system that exists and really changing the whole focus and transforming the whole system? The rest of these are "Developing the Philosophy," I think kind of connects up here with dissemination of information. "Accountability" same as on the last group. "Teacher Professional Regard" was an important one, too. That is the teacher as professional, rather than the teacher as subordinate worker, is key to major change. That kind of connects with the role of the professional. Then, these had to do with the resources. How are we going to allocate resources? Are we going to allocate resources in different ways? Then these marketing promoting change, the marketing concept that the other group...

PETER SENGE: We have one more in back. This one is interesting--you can't read the numbers on it, I can. You see fives, and sixes, threes and fours and there is a twenty-eight and a twenty-three. So, what were people really hot about?

PARTICIPANT: "Establishing a Need for Change." "Establishing a Process and Strategy for Changing the System." "Creating the Need to Establish Common Names for Learning." That was the largest, twenty-eight responses were in that category.

PETER SENGE: So it was the same sort of things we were exploring in here.

PARTICIPANT: Yes. It is a tremendous need. And valuing families and children.

PARTICIPANT: The next most prevalent response, it was sort of a catchall for a number of different issues, but it sort of fell under the issue of "Institutional Support and Dissemination of Ideas Through Better Training at Institutional Support." In that category, were some issues surrounding adequate funding of workable ideas, institutionalizing those by funding them properly and providing that kind of support for training. So, there was a lot of interrelations between those. Actions to promote communication and networking, that was another large one. There were sixteen responses and I think that was the first group that really came together. Everyone knew that in order to disseminate the information, you have to get people together, and you have to get the right decision makers and stakeholders together at the same time. That included policy makers, business leaders, as well as parents and teachers and I don't know if anyone mentioned students. I'm ashamed if we didn't, but I don't think we did. The last category we came up with, is "Changing the Perception of the

Traditional System," sort of the flip side of establishing the need for change and the process and strategies for changing the system.

PARTICIPANT: To connect, just to our own first group, they mentioned the freedom to fail. In this one it was suggested that you already have the freedom to fail as long as you fail in a traditional way.

TOM TOCH: Thank you very much. One last thought before we go on to the next part of our program here. And that is if we accept Dr. Deming's notion and the total quality concepts of intrinsic rewards and their power to motivate people in all sorts of organizations, it seems reasonable to ask, specifically, what are those sorts of intrinsic rewards that can be applied to our efforts to improve the public school system. It's not something we have talked about much yet, but I think it is worth discussion, and is related. We might want to consider what is already underway in the name of giving people a greater stake, encouraging them to take ownership of the schools and the school systems that they work in. There are things underway, as you all well know, and certainly the educators in this room know this very well. Shared decision-making being one, the magnet school movement being another, two prominent examples. To what extent, the question seems to be, can we apply some of the reforms that are already underway and have been for a decade now to some of the core concepts that Dr. Deming is offering.

The idea now, I believe is, to break back into our groups, have another forty-five minutes worth of discussion and see if you can narrow your reports, your ideas, your recommendations that much further. Before you break up, we are all going to stay in this room to do this, the question is and maybe someone can give me a hand on this, where should group one be? Group one is that room. Group two is in here. Group three is on this side of the room. Ready, break.

RICK MORRISON: While you make those moves, if I can just talk above you to remind you that this is the point at which we try to fine tune what we have discussed so far to the point of recommendations to the foundation, as to the next steps.

***

TOM TOCH: What we will do now is to take a few more minutes to hear from each of the three groups to get their further refined assessment of the recommendations that they hope to make. We'll do that--that'll take about fifteen minutes--and then Alan Blankstein will come up and close the session with a couple of different things he wants to do. Let's go in reverse order from our earlier reporting schedule. So if Peter could come up and briefly recap his groups findings.

PETER SENGE: We were in the middle of starting to explore, I thought, some quite fascinating and important issues. I'd like to say a word or two about that and then invite a few people of the group to build on what I said. First, was a distinction, which in my own experience has been a very meaningful one, making clear the aim and having people who are continually asking the question, what is our aim? I'll share with you my bias, which is I'm very much more in favor of the second than the first. The second one, will tend to produce aims but it will also produce a continual reflection on the aims. More importantly, it will tend to produce a group of people who have a much higher level of real participation and involvement in process. There was a phrase used that I think that often we say, I'm paraphrasing to see if I can get the gist of it, we say we have to clarify the aim as an excuse to sort of take away responsibility for producing results right now. Well, our aim isn't clear, so obviously we can't produce very good results. We all know that it is hard to clarify the mission, so of course it's perfectly inexplicable why the thing is a mess. I mean I would like to suggest that from many, many years of working with this business of vision in organizations, you know what? It's never clear. It's never clear. There are differences in the quality of the process. There are some times when you got a long paper that says crystal clear that our vision is. But you go out and talk to fifteen people in the organization and you will get eighteen different answers. And there are other times when you talk to those fifteen different people and you get a certain coherence of here's what we are trying to do. But it's never so clear, so simple as you state the aim. So, I thought that was a very important distinction. The idea that we all sort of talked about is, if you have a group of people who are continually asking the question, what are we trying to produce here, and that's the umbrella or the ground for everything they're doing, continually reflecting that question. That could be a very, very, creative group of people.

Second issue that came out, was that this may be difficult, particularly when you consider the multiple systems. You've got, let's say a school, just to make it concrete, where that sort of spirit is really operating and people really are continually engaged in this question, what are we really trying to create here? How do we know we are succeeding? Then you've got these other larger systems within which that system is embedded. There was some poking and prodding at the first group saying that, hey, I really buy that, and I actually subscribe to it, but I think that it is really difficult to do when you have these multiple constituents. And that led us into just the beginnings of what I felt all day is one of the most important issues to be talked about, thought through, maybe clarified as a whole: accountability in education. I just started to share what I thought was a meaningful distinction which we've come to understand in business. It is the distinction between management accounting and financial accounting. Now don't get hung up on the term financial because that is not where I am going with that. But those are totally different professions and completely different intellectual, historical roots. The field of management accounting which has by and large, been greatly neglected in this country for the last fifty years, grew up out of the need for people in a system to develop effective information systems to see how they're doing so they can better improve their efforts within their system. The field of financial accounting, grew up for a completely different reason. It grew up when we started to have external investors, and they had to have some information to people outside the system to assess how well people were doing inside the system. What we've seen in American management is that the field of financial accounting has been like Pac-Man and has eaten up management accounting. So, we now have people inside the system trying to measure how well they are doing by the same measures that were originally created for the people outside the system. It is literally like the coach sitting with binoculars looking at the scoreboard, saying guys we're three runs behind, try harder. It's crazy. To coach you have to see what is going on in the field of play. You need a rich set of data about what's going on in the processes right in front of you. That distinction, seems to me, is terribly meaningful here, I suspect it's more complicated than it is in the world of business. The same basic distinction I hear coming up again and again. It's not to say that accountability is unimportant. It's very important. There are different types of accountability for different types of actors in the system.

So, I personally think that we can't say here what our aim right now is, it's dynamic, it's evolving, we can indeed ask the question, but we can't with responsibility say here's our aim now and not say how well we know, we, inside the system, how we're doing. All learning involves assessment. Without assessment there is no learning. The kid falls down. If someone tries to convince the kid that he didn't fall down, it's not going to be very supportive that they are learning. So all learning involves assessment but we have to start to get a much richer set of distinctions for the internal assessments and the external assessments. Clearly in this world, there are tremendous issues around the interference of the external assessment process with the internal assessment process. I suspect that we are at the same sort of point that a lot of our companies have been in for sometime now, and what we are just starting to realize is that the financial accountants have been taking over the game. They are destroying our businesses as a result, because we did not continue to develop the professional managerial accounting, how to help the people inside the system. Take accountability for their worth. That's an effort to try to summarize a pretty complex set of themes. I don't know in terms of timing, I would personally like to hear from some of the people in the group to sort of add on, modify, correct that, but Tom...

TOM TOCH: I think what we are going to do is just do a brief summary of the three sessions and then Alan is going to come up and we'll have fifteen, twenty minutes for open discussion. I think that would be the best way to do that. Joe, could you come up and recap briefly your group's further thoughts.

JOE SENSENBRENNER: It's probably best done from the flip chart. What we did was really ask the people in the group to talk about a couple of things that were most important to them about the work that we had done and the work they feel needs to be done. We clustered those ideas around a question. We started off by having someone suggest who could try to define admission for a school system, maybe bring that back to the group, and very quickly came into issues of scale. What is the community? What is the size that we're really talking about? Another question that would be important for us to focus on either as a group or a sub-group, how to get the mission of quality into the school. Say somebody has decided they really want to do it. They want to be an effective advocate within their own organization. What is a good way of doing that? There are models. There are successful initiatives, not completed tasks in that regard. How to get the clients to insist on the change in the system? Another changed model. The wolf is at the door. The people from the outside are insisting that this is something that the organization needs to do. How might that unfold?

How to involve the parent, was another theme that came up from other individuals. What should be the end product, the outcome be?

Again, coming back to, what is the mission? What kinds of things do you want as the end result? What could happen in a school that would make me want to pay more, as a focus question? Getting back to can the school deliver extra value, are we talking about school education or learning? Which location? Who is the ultimate customer? As a reflection there has been very little discussion framed in those terms during the time that we've had together today. It is really bedrock quality management to have the customer define quality. And I would invite this group and others when you're looking at the process, it starts somewhere and goes somewhere. That is the customer and think about what kind of pull, what kind of systems they work in and how do they define what's coming out? Very little discussion of that today. What is the role of the superintendent in the change process? Akin to the CEO with limitations? Then some people offered some proposals on a mission. To be equipped with the necessary tools.

***

STEPHANIE PACE MARSHALL: Models of evaluation are far more competitive against someone else's ranking, etc. To provide some models where competition is against a goal rather than another individual. To narrow the scope and focus of the conference was another recommendation. Another, to focus on the skills and tools that are needed by educators and other stakeholders to transform schools and systems. Several people said we simply do not have the tools that we need. We lack the skills in managing different missions or different visions. We need to provide some resources for enhancing skill development. We need to find out what is already happening and support it. We need to sort out the existing roles of disparate groups that are working right now both in and outside of education, NASSP, ASCD, AASA, all of whom are having dialogues on quality. We want to advance the dialogues but we must make sure there is some kind of coalescence of those groups. We need to define what is manageable about Deming for education and then help school districts sort that out. We need a role for taking the general principles of Deming and applying them to school systems. We also need someone to serve as a clearing house because there's a real danger of neutralizing or bastardizing Deming and we need someone to help us sort that out. We need specific examples of practices that are already working. Several people talked about the fact that we already have some things that would embody Deming's principles: performance assessment, outcome base, cooperative learning. These are already happening in the schools. They are within the constructs of Deming, and we need more examples of that and we need to support those practices. We must involve others in the process and the last one is, Peter the one you mentioned, we need a richer set of assessments to really answer the question of how we know what we are really doing.

TOM TOCH: Nicely done. Thank you to all three of you. It is a difficult job synthesizing a great deal of disparate information and a number of different ideas. et me turn the podium over to Alan who will make some comments and give people a final chance to respond. Thank you very much.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: It's been a rolling day. I think the storms that surrounded us outside, were quite a metaphor for that which went on inside. I think that sometimes that kind of stormy interaction, whether it be percussion, discussion, or dialogue, can leave one frustrated, exhilarated, aggravated, exalted, all of the above and more. In addition to wanting to thank those who were involved with this, which I do want to do and plan to, I'd also like to elicit comments from you as to what you thought of the process, what you think we could do from here, what you thought of the recommendations that were just made, as well? As for us, we are going to in a committed, dedicated, to constancy of purpose, if you will, proceed to work with those with whom we began this process. I think there were a lot of recommendations on the table, they were quite rich. There is a lot to be done. To that extent, I would ask you to check your packet for a formal way in which I can find out who would like to be involved with us and in what manner. You'll find these cards in your packet and I would like to maintain contact with you and have a clearer idea as to how we might work together to advance the process.

I learned a lot today. I hope that's felt generally, around the room. There was a lot of learning, a lot of exchange that went on. There were some new relationships that were formed. I think that was a strong point of what has proceeded. I think we're beginning the dialogue that's necessary in cutting through the discussion and percussion in order to get some kind of shared mission and perhaps create a vision which, as Peter says, will change and will certainly be individualized. But, at least we've begun the process toward that. Or at least, I shouldn't even say begun, I think that's presumptuous, we've continued a process that you all have begun in other circles and in previous occasions and meetings. So, for those reasons alone, I would say this was a very valuable endeavor. I think many of you, as I said were probably challenged, or aggravated, or a whole number of things and all of that could be channeled into positive energy and action as well. Which is what I would like to tap into and would like to do.

First, let me thank in a very formal way, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers for their role in co-sponsoring this event with us. And in the former's case, for their dedication to this kind of pursuit. I would also like to thank the City University of New York, which provided the space and to thank Baugh Enterprises and Gant Travel management, both of which helped us in this event. I'd like to thank all of the panelists and everyone who came here because you really put out a lot of positive energy. You dedicated your day to this event. There is tremendous commitment around this room, and I wish we would have had a week to spend together, and perhaps as a result of what has occurred today, we will have a week to spend together. Because it is going to take many weeks. One of the things that was brought up, was the question of time and getting time and concentrating time and committing it to this kind of dialogue. It's so important. Just the thoughts, the exchange and where that brings you is so essential and it's something that we value so little. We only put our emphasis on something that we can touch. Action, the desks, the computers, but what about the kid's minds? What about our minds? What about the sharing of our thinking? That's all worth a great deal and it's worth putting your time into. So, without any further summation from me, I would really like to hear from you.

PARTICIPANT: Will a summary paper of all the recommendations and the proceedings be prepared and shared with all the participants?

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: To the extent that it is possible, it will. What I am referring to there, is that we have lots of little note pads and we have stickys. My understanding is that a great portion of this has been recorded both for the PBS production that will follow and in an audio manner. So, to the extent that we can get Stephanie and others to give me their notes, we can compile that. Yes.

PARTICIPANT: We have had a lot of talk about vision. I don't understand what your vision is. What is it that you are trying to create here?

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I'm trying to bring together a base of knowledge that has evolved over a great deal of time. I think Peter has his finger on that. I think Dr. Deming has done a lot of work with that. I think many of us have our own basis of knowledge. But I would like to advance the level on which we are all operating, because ultimately, for me, the real important factor, as I said this morning, is reaching, perhaps saving, the next generation. I think there are ways to do that, there are ways to empower children, ways to treat them as whole beings as opposed to discrete entities. There are ways to set up systems that will support that and will be meaningful and healthy for kids. So, that's really what I see. I see this as a building block towards that, having that kind of exchange of information and more importantly of knowledge.

PARTICIPANT: I guess my real question is something that has been puzzling me all along, what happens to all these recommendations? What happens to all the information that you coordinated, collected, collated. The gentleman asked if we are going to get a copy of that, the answer was not clear. I'd like to know what's going to happen to all the recommendations and wisdom of all the people that you have gathered.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Well, what we have done in the past, we've had three of these forums, and in the past we have tried to keep the scope a little bit more narrow, and now you can see why. We didn't involve participants other than panelists and in those cases, we put together transcripts. Since we had the kind of structure we had today, I can't have complete transcripts, but what we did with those transcripts and what we will do with what we can compile here is to get it out to everyone. Does that answer your question? I don't think that's enough. What do you do beyond that? The next step is, for example, disseminating this information beyond this group. My thinking, initially, was there were three good starting points. One is, what about setting up a pilot? We have some committed superintendents in this room, and there are others around the nation who are positively predisposed toward actualizing some of what we have discussed today. I will work with them, our organization will work with them, and hopefully you will and others in the room will, now that we have had this kind of dialogue, toward bringing to fruition some of the ideas that we have discussed today.

Another thing is the dissemination to a wider group. I don't know if they are still here, but we have had in the room over the course of the day, *The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *The Washington Post*, *USA Today*. These are some of the good channels for dissemination of information, but we are going to go beyond that and try to involve other stakeholders in this process.

The third thing is, what can we as a group do? I think that we can do a lot of things. I mean the cards that I gave you to fill out will give me ideas that I never had about what we can do. But certainly, we should reconvene again. We should concentrate the kind of time that we all have identified as being essential to really coming something concrete and advancing the dialogue. Did I answer your question? Do you have a suggestion right now, incidently?

PARTICIPANT: Well, yes, I handed it in. It came out of our group.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Are you John? Well, I have it right here. I'll pick it right up.

PARTICIPANT: It would have been very helpful to me to have the fourteen Deming principles and to talk about them specifically. For example, he talks about optimization of the individual. What does that mean? One of his principles, as I read it from somebody else's transcript, is institute leadership. I mean, what does that mean? Just the way it's phrased, and the language that is used, does not seem inconsistent with what I know about how schools develop, or how change is brought about. The other suggestion is, which also came from a member of our group, who either works with Ford or has worked with Ford, to get a group of people in a team together and then see exactly what they did in order to produce, for example, the Taurus. Which was the car, from what I understand from Tom Peters, that was created by having an awful lot of intra-systemic cooperation not competition. Then again, a team from a school, maybe Joel's school together and ask the question, Peter's been asking, how well have we done, what are we doing well? What can we learn from what's happening? I agree with you that you need more conversations than this because one-shot-deals don't make much of a difference.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I think the time constraint was really a problem.

BETTY MCCORMICK: I'm Betty McCormick from the governor's office of Texas, and I would like to announce that the governor is going to be hosting a conference on the subject called "Quality and Education: Critical Linkages." It's November 9th and 10th in Houston. It's a national invitational conference, and we are really going to try to showcase some examples of quality and action in education, what's actually happened. It's being co-hosted by the National Center for Manufacturing Science. Rich Cohen is here representing that group. So this is one potential follow-up supporting efforts that Alan has started.

PARTICIPANT: Our district has been working very closely with Dr. Bill Glasser, and we are considering opening a laboratory school in the Fall of 1993 with his direction. I'm really kind of curious why he wasn't involved in this. It seems to me that his work compliments what you're about very well.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I had no objection to his being involved. He could very easily have been. Had he been involved I know that there would have been a lot more discussion of what quality means than the little that you heard between Dr. Deming and others. He does talk about total quality management and he does talk about things that short-change the whole power of what Dr. Deming talks about. But that's another issue. He could have come.

PARTICIPANT: It seems to me that there is a danger in thinking that we can intellectualize this process. Most of us who work in schools were very successful in a system that now we profess to want to change. That's kind of a visceral comfort we've got. It's not going to be easily changed. We can't intellectualize our way out of this because it's so much a part of how we live our whole lives, not just our professional lives. So it seems to me that we had better tread lightly, because if we leap too quickly into what we think we understand, before we really understand the consequences of it, there might be a lot of quick and easy failures and a lot of reason not to ever try it again.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: That's something that concerns many of us. Incidently, this is good time to thank Sue Miller-Hurst, speaking of intellectualizing, because she brought just a little piece of another vision, another approach into the room which is a feat in and of itself and I think we all enjoyed it, and I appreciated that.

PARTICIPANT: It's easy, since we stretched our minds now, to go on back to our offices and use some of those killer phrases like well, that will never work, or that was somebody else's situation. I did a survey two years ago and collected about four thousand, what I called "killer phrases." I narrowed it down to the top ten and I made a poster for my own office and I brought about fifty copies of it. It's like, "we tried that before", "get a committee to look into it", "if it ain't broken, fix it". So, I'll donate, I'll put them on the table, if anyone wants one, take one and put it on your wall.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Well, we tried that before...Other?

PARTICIPANT: We used that word dialogue frequently today but in all honesty, I think despite our best intentions, this dialogue is a one-way street, even among the panelists there was very little dialogue and very little opportunity for dialogue, given the structure of the meeting all day. I was very frustrated by that all through the day. It was like that in the small groups as well. As soon as we started to have a dialogue we had to reconvene back to the group.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Right. I understand. It frustrated me too. I'm with you on that, I think that it's a structural problem that we're facing. If you have some ideas on how to address it, I'm all ears.

PETER SENGE: I'm, obviously, sort of the culprit of this by bringing it up in the first place; I think it's really appropriate to observe what you have observed. This is not a setting in which you can explore dialogue seriously. We have a major research program going on trying to understand how dialogue can develop in a variety of settings, including school settings. It takes a considerable period of time. It takes a group of people that will keep working on it. My main purpose in bringing it up was to put it in your awareness. I really think that it is such an important distinction that, at the very least, starting to think about it and at some level, I think intuitively, we really all have a pretty darn good idea that there is a distinction in dialogue. We haven't acknowledged that distinction publicly. I don't mean that it in any way to trivialize. The belief is that as soon as we make the distinction in our mind, we can start doing it. That's not true. There's a lot of things, and once you have the distinction you have to start dealing with. But, that's a first step and so that was my intent in bringing it up here and emphasizing it a little bit. I think it has a big role to play and we can all start searching out ways in which we, in the groups in which we really operate, could start developing it.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Incidently, these questions or remarks don't necessarily have to be directed to me. You can direct it to one another. You can respond to one another. I think it is a good opportunity to get some dialogue and to get some more interaction going.

PARTICIPANT: I was just curious today, we talked a lot about the Deming model and what his beliefs are with respect to education. I wondered if this group was going to look into other people's views in terms of like a Chubb and Moe from the Brookings Institutes or other groups that have suggestions for different structures for schools.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: When you say this group are you referring to all the people around you, or to our group? I don't see a need to tread on the waters of Chubb and Moe. They seem to do just fine.

PARTICIPANT: I mean other areas. In other words, are you prescribing to the Deming model? Is your group endorsing that?

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Yes it is. I don't think the Deming model is even a good term for it, but I think that the process and some of the principles that are involved in that are consistent with our values and what we know to work. So, it is certainly one of the things you'll hear from us over and over again. Was that Phil?

PHIL SCHLECHTY: I have a couple of things. One, very little has been said in the course of discussion today, about the use of technology, maybe it's a given. Also, very little has been said about the way our young people should learn, get in some context. I think, by in the way, what is the role of the teacher in all of this? I think that is critical no matter what model you're looking at. Because we are immersed, then. I think as we dialogue and discuss improving education, public education and all education, there needs to be set context. In terms in continuing this discussion, may I suggest, that one way some of us might be able to do that, would be on computer conferencing networks. There are a number of them out there. There are a number of people doing a very similar thing. I'm sure those who are in primary education would be very interested in the substance of this discussion, today. And may want to continue it, and add to it. May I suggest that?

Secondly, are we going to get a participants list and summary?

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: I hadn't thought of it. Does everyone want a participants list? Well, you could continue the dialogue that way. Sure. No problem.

Anyone want to respond? Is that Gail?

GAIL STEPHENS: Yes. It's not an electronic network, because we haven't been able to figure out how to manage it with the resources that we have, but the American Association of School Administrators does operate a network on total quality applications in education. It started out as pretty much resources that we collected going out to people who are interested, and more and more we are trying to build it to people to actually dialogue with each other through that network. If anyone is interested I certainly can give you a card to call the American Association of School Administrators when it shows up on the list that Alan is sending out. We'll be happy to include you on that.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: Before that, Gail, we have had in this room most of the major association executive directors, and I think it's really worthwhile to take what Deming said to heart in regard to the cost of competition and the cost of competing. He gave the example of telephone companies. Ron Brandt is sitting in front of you. You know the other association heads have been around. Stephanie is in the room. I think that it would really pay for us, if we are committed to this, to sit down together and say, OK, if you got the network in place, how can we bolster that? What can we do to supplement that? And so on and so forth with regard to any and all efforts. So that we don't duplicate because there is such a big task out there. We are all needed. There is no need to rub up against one another.

DR. DEMING: That would be revolutionary in itself.

RICK MORRISON: I guess I just want to say this as a board member, just reassure this gentleman, his concern is one that as board members we all feel quite deeply. How do you come up with ideas that are inclusive of enough professionals in the industry so that, once they are announced, there is enough ownership from your own input that those ideas are going to be taken seriously, yet, keep in constant mind the time constraints that we all operate in? If possible for instance to create dialogue, if you will, just to follow what Peter suggests, in a room this size with this many people. How do we accomplish both those tasks by keeping ownership amongst an industry when you make suggestions like: we wish to try and yet have it done in a way that's effective enough that people believe that it will work. Let me encourage you and everyone else who feels they may have ideas toward the practicality of that. How is it the foundation might move toward making everyone feel more inclusive to taking that sort of ownership? We are very open eared to that sort of advice, and I do encourage you to stay in touch with us as we will reach out to you for that sort of news.

ALAN BLANKSTEIN: It is five to five. We had added an extra hour in case anyone wants to dangle around. There are some very, bright, interesting and influential people sitting around. You might want to talk with one another. But, before I just let you wander and meander, any other burning questions for any of the other panel heads? For me? We've got time for maybe one or two more if it's burning....OK, then we will move ahead on this. I really thank you all for coming. And thanks to Peter and Joe and Stephanie and Sue Miller-Hurst, for all their work on this. Thank you.